



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

ISAAC FOOT COLLECTION



LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

ISAAC FOOT COLLECTION

F

“And all the windows of my heart I open to the day.”—
WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS, VOL. II.

Edited by

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE,

And Published at Acomb, near York, by

HENRY B. BINNS.

1899.

CONTENTS OF

VOL. II.

- January - Preface.
THE OUTLOOK.
- February - WORSHIP.
Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology*. M. A. Wallis.
Fairbairn's *Catholicism*.
- March - THE FACT OF SIN.
Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*. F. A. Russell.
- April - THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.
The Temperance Problem. R. Spence Watson.
- May - THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
McGiffert's *Apostolic Age*. J. Rendel Harris.
- June - WORK FOR PEACE.
Illingworth's *Personality*. Joan M. Fry.
- July - THE SUMMER SCHOOL.
The Y. M. Letter on *Worship and Ministry*.
- August - ROBERT BARCLAY OF URY. F. A. Russell.
Cheyne's *Jewish Religious Life*. G. Buchanan Gray.
- September - THE PROBLEM OF A FREE MINISTRY.
Grubb's *Social Aspects of the Quaker Faith*.
- October - QUAKER EDUCATION.
PRIESTLINESS. Thomas Hodgkin.
"WHEN THERE IS NO PEACE." Henry B. Binns.
Robertson's *Christian Minister*. M. Catharine Albright.
- November- THE PROPHETS' NURSERY.
"APOSTATE." Henry B. Binns.
The Writings of M. Maeterlinck. Hugh E. Seebohm.
- December- A PLEA FOR A QUAKER SETTLEMENT.
Fiske's Little Books. John W. Graham.

ERRATA.

November, page 11, line 9, for "eleven" read "ten."

" " 11, " "

“ And all the windows of my heart I open to the day.”—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

PREFACE.

THE OUTLOOK : AN EDITORIAL.

January, 1899.

Price 4d.

Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

Published at ACOMB, York, by H. B. BINNS.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

PREFACE.

THE first series of these Essays was issued at irregular intervals by a small Editorial Committee for private distribution only. The Present Day Papers have now become the property of one of the Editors, and are offered for sale as a monthly series. Their scope and purpose were set forth in a recent circular announcing the appearance of the present number :—

“The essays will continue to be broad, free, and constructive. They will still deal with the problems now confronting the Society of Friends; but while from time to time offering practical suggestions towards the solution of these problems, the editors do not profess to be in possession of the last word. They will be satisfied if the Present Day Papers contribute to stimulate and simplify discussion.

“We seek breadth of view and an openness to all truth. We desire to handle the subjects selected in a practical and positive manner. While welcoming all honest criticism which is constructive in its aim, our Present Day Papers cannot afford to degenerate into what is merely destructive or

analytical. This volume will be, if we may so express it, a practical book of working drawings, which is now become necessary if the work on our city of habitation is to go forward.

"The health of our Society, upon which its efficiency depends, is still conditioned by individual faithfulness; and, in order to reach the individual, may we seek your co-operation in extending the circulation of the Present Day Papers among all to whom they can appeal, but especially those in membership with us?"

In "The Outlook" we have endeavoured to indicate some of the problems which lie before us, and roughly to map out the ground which we propose to traverse in succeeding papers.

THE EDITORS.

The Outlook :

An Editorial.

THE OUTLOOK.

“IN the consideration of this undaunted steadfastness” writes Sewel in his history of our Society, “it hath seemed to me that there have been some . . . among this people whose talent was valiantly to endure persecution for a good cause, and who, perhaps, in ease would not have been such good Christians as they proved to be under these sufferings ; resembling the Camomil in this, which the more it is depressed or rubbed, the better it grows, and yields a stronger scent. Being then thus oppressed, they found themselves under a necessity of continuing vigilant and watchful. . . This made them love what they judged to be truth more than their lives, and it caused them to be careful lest that should come over them which the Church of Ephesus was threatened with, because she had left her first love, viz., the removing of her candlestick out of its place. Thus their mutual fellowship increased, and their own lives they valued not when the grieving of their consciences stood in competition with it. Having thus passed through many adversities with an unwearied and lasting patience, and being become a great people known

by the name of Quakers, they were at length, by the generous clemency of King William III. and the favour of the Parliament, declared to be a society who should henceforward be tolerated in the kingdom as Protestant Dissenters, with liberty to perform their religious worship in public without disturbance."

Such words are not without their significance for us on the threshold of the twentieth century. This is the last year of the eighteen-hundreds; and though, strictly speaking, it does not close the century, yet its passing will seem to usher us into a new world.

It is no false sentiment which bids us draw out a balance sheet or statement of our moral solvency. The end of the century is a proper time for spiritual stock-taking; the last year is the balancing-day for the ledger we, as the Society of Friends, are keeping with the world. It is essential that we estimate our true position, scrupulously allowing due depreciation on all our stock of inherited tradition and testimony, before calculating the net profits. 1899 is the third stock-taking in this record. Let us turn back to our folio for 1699.

A melancholy interest attaches to those days of the retreating tide. Persecution and the ministry of George Fox had closed almost together. Even in Sewel's time the Society, lately possessed by the energy of overwhelming

faith, was sinking into a rich, "respectable," and conservative religious sect, dominated by the fear of losing those liberties it had so gloriously won. It went with the times ; it ceased to lead them. For Quakerism passed from the apostolic vision of the Kingdom of God into the prose of Quietism and Commerce. Over England broke the cold dawn of the Augustan Age, an era of shrewd, ungenerous common-sense. The last legend of Miltonic might was dying with Dryden. This year, Swift made that pitifully characteristic resolution against the natural kindliness of his heart—"not to be fond of children, or let them come near me hardly." William III., so lately hailed the champion of English liberties, had become an unpopular king. The national temper was uncertain and factious. An habitual suspicion of all enthusiasms was settling down over England. Men devoted themselves to what is called "practical work." Trade was to be built up, and an empire founded over-seas.

Amid such conditions William Penn sailed a second time for his colony, after preaching a notable sermon at Westminster, and calling upon his hearers "to live in the exercise of that divine gift and grace and ability which our Lord Jesus Christ hath distributed and communicated to every member of his body, that we may come to shine as stars in the firmament of Glory." Although the trouble with George Keith, resulting at length in his expulsion,

had shaken the Society in America very grievously, there were at this time some forty meetings established beyond the Atlantic, and Friends held positions of importance in several of the colonies.*

The history of English Friends during the seventeenth century is so familiar that we need not dwell on the great difficulties Fox and his friends overcame within the Fellowship. The whole trouble with Story and Wilkinson is one of the most instructive episodes in our history. There we discover the practical common-sense of Fox, and his recognition of the right place and divine significance of Church organization. He saw the necessity of including both pastoral and prophetic labour within the conception of a free spiritual ministry. His later years were largely occupied in the construction of Church machinery, and in conflict with unpractical and disintegrating forms of mysticism. After his death this work was continued, with varying wisdom and ability, throughout the succeeding century. Unhappily, such labours, necessary and excellent in themselves, tended to replace, rather than supplement, the proper functions of the Church. We find organization, repression and discipline, superseding the ruder, healthier, more aggressive work of missionary enterprise. A Chinese Wall, shutting out the world, was rising round the Society.

* It is interesting to note that in 1696 the Yearly Meeting at Philadelphia had advised Friends not to encourage the importation of negroes.

Friends became separated from the life of their contemporaries, and in their isolation seemed almost to lose touch with progress. But positive results were not entirely wanting. There were Friends who laboured earnestly, within these narrower limits, to build up Quaker character and uphold the standard of truth in commercial and social life.

Let us note the new outlook in 1799. The Society in Great Britain has dwindled in the century from sixty-six thousand Friends to some twenty-eight thousand members and attenders.* The time has passed when John Camm could write to Fox out of the West of England, "We hit one every day we shoot, for our bow abides in strength." The Society is no longer representative of the vital element in Dissent. Its candlestick has been removed out of its place. Whitfield and the Wesleys had been the evangelists of the eighteenth century, while among Friends the spirit of worldliness had prevailed. In 1798 we find the Yearly Meeting expressing the following concerns :—

"We fear that some of our youth are being trained in habits of expense in attire, furniture and attendance, which are not only inconsistent with the simplicity of the Gospel,

*The sixty-six thousand Friends of 1699 were hardly members of a religious sect. The idea of a close membership, as distinct from broad "fellowship in the truth," was a development of the eighteenth century. The *total* membership, however, had not declined, for the larger part of the Society was now to be found in America.

but absorb property which might be better employed in feeding the hungry, and time which might be occupied in visiting and cheering the habitations of human misery."

Again, in a paragraph directed against the custom of making profit by military and naval preparations :—"How reproachfully inconsistent would it be to oppose an active compliance with warlike measures, and at the same time to enrich ourselves by the commerce and other circumstances dependent on war."

While these words reveal the decadence of the Society they also indicate an evangelical spirit troubling the passive Quietism* of Friends. And there was much in the contemporary conditions of life to call for an active Faith.

The year 1799 saw Napoleon First Consul, and England draining her strength to support the burden of a world-war, whilst, at the same time, her entire social fabric was being reconstructed by modern industrialism. The first and worst Factories, unhampered by laws against the employment of children, were springing up like

* By Quietism is here meant all dwelling upon mystical truth as detached from its right connection with the salvation of the world. A wholesome zeal for that salvation is the mark of Evangelicalism. But, without a basis of mysticism, evangelicalism misses its real strength. The use of the word "evangelical" to describe a special type of theology is not to be confounded with its proper use.

mushrooms in the secluded valleys of Lancashire and Yorkshire. A golden age for Cotton Lords and Land-owners had dawned ; yet corn reached the famine price of 127s., while many towns were crowded with half-starved and brutalized labourers from the country. If her commerce was making England rich, her ministers were pursuing a spendthrift policy. With one hand Pitt was lavishing subsidies on Austria and Russia, and with the other squandering money through the pauperizing medium of the old Poor Laws. "The problem of pauperism," says Arnold Toynbee, "came upon men in its most terrible form between 1795 and 1834." Meantime, Friends shared in the extraordinary development of English commerce which accompanied the European war. They were thus again brought into contact with the facts of life, and into renewed interest in the human problem.

In 1799 Friends were already the most stalwart supporters of Clarkson and Wilberforce. Lancaster, with the co-operation of Friends, had just established the first of his monitorial Schools, thus laying the corner stone of English popular education. Tuke had founded The Retreat at York. Grellet was making his third ministerial journey in the United States ; and Elizabeth Gurney, more familiar to us as Elizabeth Fry, was on the eve of her marriage. The recital of these names suggests the philanthropic efforts in which influential Friends were engaged. But their

philanthropy, noble and fruitful as it was, hardly offered a solution to the Social Problem. And further than Philanthropy, at this time Friends did not go.

The year 1799 saw the beginning of the Religious Tract Society, and the capture by a French privateer of the London Missionary Society's vessel "Duff" bound for the South Sea Islands. Evangelical Christianity, with its Bible distribution and Missionary enterprise at home and abroad, and all its practical beneficence, had extended beyond the borders of Methodism and was soon to sweep the churches out of their deism, mysticism and sectarianism into broad Christian efforts for the salvation of the world. Friends were now to feel the full force of this current.

But the Evangelical movement was met at this period by a widespread popular scepticism supported by the destructive philosophy of the French Revolution. Even in the Society of Friends, on both sides of the Atlantic, it was opposed by a species of intellectual Deism, and the drift of contemporary Quietism towards a Unitarian theology.

But just as Unitarian teachings, with all their nobility, fail to stir the heart, so in the present century that opposed form of theology, known as "evangelical" (in the narrow sense), has conspicuously failed to command

the intellect. We confess that if the "broadening" of Evangelical theology is to involve the loss of its directness and power in saving men, we would have it always "narrow," for Evangelicalism, in spite of its "narrowness," has been the salvation of the Church. But, in the words of the late Dr. Dale, "the vigorous and the cultivated need salvation as well as the ignorant and the wretched. The intellect as well as the heart has to be claimed for Christ." Turning to 1899 we find that this comparative failure of the "evangelical" movement presents one of the pressing problems of our immediate outlook.

Our day is indeed beset with importunate questions. "There is abroad in men's minds an instinctive feeling . . . that we are entering on a new era. . ." Magnificent as is the record of scientific and industrial development in the nineteenth century, "the fact of our time which overshadows all others," writes Benjamin Kidd at the close of his notable book, "is the arrival of Democracy." But this great development in our Social Evolution is full of hope. It "is the crowning result of an ethical movement in which qualities and attributes which we have all been taught to regard as the very highest of which human nature is capable, find the completest expression they have ever reached in the history of the race." This is the deliberate statement of a sociological student. If then the advent of this new democracy

is the crowning result of Christian ethics, the Society of Friends may indeed take courage and go forward, though not with ungirt loins. We claim that the truth held by Friends approximates most nearly to the religion of the future democracy, but we must admit that it is far from being the religion of the present. If Friends have failed to impress their view of truth upon the age, what is the secret of that failure? Does their adherence to mere customs, and their almost superstitious reverence for their church traditions, withhold this truth from the world? A new-born conception of the social religion of Brotherhood and co-operative fellowship, ideas which are the very essence of a Society of Friends, have come with the advent of democracy, yet they are not naturally associated with us in the minds of men! The Society must be identified with these conceptions, illuminating them with its own free and simple spirituality.

We believe that Friends are becoming conscious of their great opportunity. Comparing the condition of our Society in 1899 with that a century earlier, certain important developments are manifest. The number of members, though entirely failing to keep pace with the growth of population, is now at least increasing. Once more the Society is becoming aggressive; the age of quietism is behind us; we are again an evangelistic body. It is not only that Friends are carrying on organized effort in Adult School, and Foreign

and Home Mission Work, but a new spirit of Faith is found amongst us, a more inclusive, more Christ-like attitude toward the whole of life. We are realizing at last that science and religion are not irreconcilable antagonists ; that a love of beautiful things, and zeal for the building of God's City on earth are not incompatible. Our God is one God ; the Father-Spirit of Jesus and of men is Maker of Heaven and Earth ; One God within us and without ; Creator and Redeemer.

Friends' First Day Schools for men and women, in many respects the most important work of our Society in the past hundred years, date from the last century. But the work took little hold of the Society till the action of Joseph Sturge brought it into prominence. The famous Birmingham Conference of 1847 was the birthday of the Friends' First Day School Association, which now claims some 45,000 scholars, including nearly 30,000 men and more than 7,000 women. In the course of fifty years the movement has undergone considerable change. In most of our classes elementary teaching has naturally ceased to occupy a position of principal importance. But the deeply religious idea of fellowship which our Schools have fostered has grown with them, and they have become, more and more, centres for the intelligent discussion and consideration of living religious and social questions.

The second great development of our organised aggressive work is that of Foreign Missions. The

remarkable journeys made by early Friends travelling in the ministry to many foreign countries, had almost ceased during the eighteenth century, but were again renewed at the opening of the nineteenth. It was at length, however, recognised that, valuable as such journeys are, and will always continue to be, there was need for more continuous and localized labour.

In 1866, the Society sent out its first missionaries to carry on systematic evangelistic, pastoral and educational work. The Friends' Foreign Mission Association now reports no less than eighty-one missionaries in the field, while the subscriptions for 1895, in aid of their work, represent a contribution of 13/6 per member. The noble self-denial and faith which has recently brought our Friends into positions of the greatest peril, especially in Madagascar and China, and the loyal support of the Society at home, augur well for the aggressive work of the coming century.

From Foreign Mission work, let us turn to its counterpart at home. Our Home Mission organization dates from 1881, when a Conference of Adult School workers and others met to consider the growth of individual effort in the various branches of Home Mission work, and also the difficult question of closed meeting-houses.*

* Nearly one hundred appear to have been closed between 1801 and 1876. This cannot be entirely accounted for by economic and social

An earnest desire was expressed at this Conference to commit the Society to the evangelization of the masses, then being carried on by individuals without official recognition, and the condition of our smaller meetings was seen to demand a change in organization. How serious was this condition is seen in the following figures, obtained by the late Joseph Thorp, in the course of an investigation for the Meeting of Ministry and Oversight.*

In 1866 more than a third of the meetings in Great Britain and Ireland were shown to be without a minister. In 380 meetings enumerated, 140 were without either acknowledged or unacknowledged ministry of their own. Of the remaining 240, more than a third (86) lingered under a "one-man ministry." So far as statistics are concerned, this left only 40 per cent. of our meetings satisfactorily supplied with ministers. A report, furnished from a different source in 1892, shows that, while the small meetings are probably in a healthier condition than thirty years ago, a large proportion still call for earnest care. Unhappily the smaller meetings do not stand alone. Many

changes. Friends have not solved the problem of the country districts. The Wesleyans have their system of local preachers, and the Church of England has of course its heavily subsidized Establishment. Friends have yet to overcome the weakness to which many of their closed country meeting-houses are a silent and melancholy witness.

* These figures will be referred to in greater detail in a subsequent paper.

large meetings are far from that condition of aggressive health which should be normal in a living church. There are some which must, we fear, be described as unvitalized inorganic bodies, whose size is therefore rather lamentable than encouraging from any Christian standpoint.

Returning to the Home Mission Committee itself we may note that, at the outset, the Yearly Meeting, while cordially appointing it, was careful to recite the fundamental Quaker ideal of the necessary call and freedom of the Spirit for the individual worker; and, in its first report, the Committee states that, while "in two instances we have deemed it right to give pecuniary assistance" to Friends who were devoting a very large portion of their time to missionary effort, "the nature of their service will, we trust, satisfy the Yearly Meeting that the pecuniary help which we have rendered can neither be regarded as 'payment for preaching' nor as in any way 'at variance with those views concerning the right call to the ministry of the Gospel, and the freeness of its exercise,' which have ever been precious to us." The report of 1893 gave the names of 43 workers to whom grants amounting to £4000 were made. The year following saw a change effected in the character of the Committee which was now brought within the organization of the Society, and since then the number of workers under the Committee appears to have declined. If this means that aggressive work has been checked it is to be

regretted, but if, as we believe, the missionary work of the Society has been stimulated by the Committee, this decline may prove to have some compensating advantages.

In 1895 the Home Mission Committee entered upon new work. Considering "the ignorance and misconception which exist around us as to the Society of Friends," and the absolute need of bringing the Society into contact with the more cultured and educated, as well as the poorer classes, and having regard also to the duty it owes to its own thoughtful and cultivated young people,—the Committee decided to ask the Yearly Meeting to afford an opportunity for discussing the important questions raised by these considerations. The outcome of this request was the Manchester Conference of November, 1895, to which may be traced the idea of the Scarborough Summer School of 1897 and its continuation work. To some it seems a far cry from the Home Mission Committee of the '80's to this latest development of the Evangelical spirit, but the logical sequence of events is really unbroken, and affords an example of the evolution of religious thought as it illuminates chamber after chamber, until the whole great house of life blazes at every window with the glory of God.

In the process of this development we are being led to the difficult problem of the Quaker ministry.

The whole question of the organisation, training, and support of that ministry needs earnest consideration if we are to adjust it to modern conditions. The present system, or lack of system, has practically failed, and Friends have seemed unwilling to face the extreme gravity of the situation. In such re-organisation as may be necessary, we must not be hampered by mere tradition. The power of Christianity, in contrast with a faith like Islam, lies in its adaptability to changing needs ; and, if Quakers are to mistake elasticity of method for the abandonment of principle, Quakerism cannot survive. Yesterday's truth is inefficacious unless it be re-born within the heart of the new generation. Let us accustom ourselves and our children to believe that the Society of the Friends of Truth does not, and cannot exist to accomplish the stereotyping of any formularised doctrine or system upon the mind of the world. It exists to bear testimony that God reveals to every generation the truth needful for its nourishment and guidance.

After this partial and rapid survey of our position, the question arises—Whither, then, are we moving ; and what do we aim to reach ?

The chief work of our Adult Schools has been the enlightened and enlightening study of the Bible, and the creation of a large sphere for the exercise of pastoral gifts. But the principal benefit we have derived from this work has been the searching test it has applied to our

theories and traditions, and to the sincerity of our desire to make the Society of Friends a generous Fellowship rather than a narrow and exclusive sect. Our Adult Schools may become the apparatus of our social laboratory, and the forging places for those swords of spiritual and social regeneration which Christ sends upon the earth. They must tell in the politics of municipal and village life, for they exist not for themselves, nor even for their members, but for the sake of the community.

Foreign Missions again have accustomed us to the idea of paid pastoral work, which we cannot regard as contrary to the protest of Fox against the hireling ministry of his day. Fox's protest was especially provoked by a state-supported church, which involved an association of ideas to his mind incompatible. The refusal to pay tithes and the disownment of those married by a priest were testimonies to the spirituality of the church. But Fox was assisted by the hospitality of his Friends through the many journeys which made up the later years of his life work, and, in so far, he lived up to the teaching that "the labourer is worthy of his hire." If we regard the wealth of individuals as held by them in trust for the community, it is an obvious deduction that they who have money, or bread, or clothing, should minister to the needs of those fellow labourers whose time is occupied in the necessary work of the church. There is no essential difference

—as is sometimes urged—between gifts of hospitality and gifts of money. It is not payment but professionalism against which we raise our protest. How we are to guard against the latter, with its clerical tendencies and accompanying parasitism, is a practical question we have yet to answer.

Finally, Home Mission work, in its later and broader development, has shown, once and for all, the absolute necessity of combining intellectual earnestness and tolerance with evangelistic zeal. Thought in all its forms, and action in all its variety, must be evangelised and won for the cause of the brotherhood, which is the cause of Jesus Christ. Art and Science must take their due place in our appeal to the world. We believe worldliness to be a state of mind that cannot be judged solely by external conduct. A regular attender at meeting may prove more worldly than many a theatre-goer. We cannot set up the inconsistent and utterly superficial standard which would refuse membership to those earnestly convinced of our principles, on the mere ground of external conduct in matters on which the sincerest Christians are not agreed.

The evangelical spirit represented in our Home Mission work is undergoing a change which will, we believe, bring with it an added power for good. A century ago, Evangelical Christianity brought back religion out of the æsthetic mysticism and barren deism in which it had been

lost; it brought the church once more into touch with the great throbbings of the passion-burdened heart of humanity; it demonstrated anew the reality of conversion, so distasteful to the pseudo-philosophic mind, so dear to the heart of faith. Preached at first in a somewhat crude and narrow form, the doctrine of conversion has gradually become more catholic. Conversion is the change of heart consequent upon the revelation of the will of God. This is a necessary experience in every religious life, but we must not confine the thought to a sudden and revolutionary change. To many a soul, well-born and nurtured in the love of all things lovely, the growth in grace is a continual, evolutionary process. Sins there have been, and repentance; but the dominant longing was always for more light, the normal desire for the highest. To such men and women the change of will and vision of duty come gradually, not dramatically; their whole life is a process of patient and faithful transformation and renewal of mind. It is important that in our Home Mission work this more comprehensive understanding of conversion should be found. A narrower view would exclude a large and living part of the church of Christ from co-operation in active service.

Our missionary work has called for such lengthy consideration that, in conclusion, we can only give a few words to the important subject of the work-a-day life of our society.

Little can our preaching and praying further us or the Kingdom, unless they be rooted in honest and even sacramental relations to our fellow-men. There is something even nobler than the support of missionaries to the heathen at home and abroad by generous subscriptions, and that is the support given by a church whose energies are all "in Christ Jesus," and directed toward the salvation of the world. Our work-a-day life and our missionary enterprise are inseparable. Abroad, our coarse British Imperialism often belies the sincerity of our missionaries. Imperialism has infected not only both English political parties, but also every section of the Anglo-Saxon race. Increase of territory, however, brings with it increase of responsibility. To quote from a recent article in *The Times*,* "No deeper, no more enduring responsibility has been laid upon the British peoples, nay, upon the peoples of the whole English-speaking world, than that which presents itself in the situation with which they are now confronted, at the end of the nineteenth century, in this matter of our future relations to the Tropics. . . . They can only be governed as a trust for civilisation, and with a full sense of the responsibility which such a trust involves." This conception of political responsibility for the native races in our care must underlie our Foreign Mission work.

*By Benjamin Kidd.

At home the triumph of a soulless commercialism calls for practical protest. It is continually thrown in our teeth that we are "meek and money-loving Quakers." A disinterested commercial life would not only render that phrase obsolete but would do much to solve the social problem. While sanely taking our part in developing the latent resources of the earth, we must labour for Christ and the Brotherhood, not for the accumulation of selfish riches. Whereas Socialism has failed to accomplish its own prophecies, Friends may, if they will, become the truer Christian Socialists of the twentieth century. We it is who must practice the high doctrine of John Woolman, tailor, that all wealth is a stewardship. We must insist upon the responsibility of purchaser and investor, as well as of the employer of labour. To be in the world, and yet not of it,—to engage in commercial and professional careers, and yet to preserve the simplicity and watchful loving-kindness of the Christian, calls for a peculiar tenderness of spirit and closeness of walk with God.

Amid the many claims and voices of the modern world the refreshment and power of the true Friends' Meeting is especially needed.

If the Quaker was once a recluse he can be so no longer. The wall of isolation has fallen. The richness and fascination of modern life opens out before him. A feeble meeting might retain its younger members when artificial

boundaries shut in their horizon ; but stronger ties are needed to-day. Warm human sympathy and the vivid, hopeful, practical perception of what their Christian careers may be, will alone retain them. And on their side the sense of this living human fellowship will deepen into the consciousness of fellowship with God. Then without fear may our doors stand open to all the world, for our ministry will speak to its condition, and it will come in to us ; and our candlestick will be returned into its place, because we have come back to our first love.

“ And all the windows of my heart I open to the day.”—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

WORSHIP.

REVIEWS :

BEYSCHLAG'S NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY :

M. A. WALLIS.

FAIRBAIRN'S CATHOLICISM :

THE EDITORS.

February, 1899.

Price 4d.

Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

**NOTE.—The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles
and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.**

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

I.

Worship.

WORSHIP.

“**T**HE profoundest of all human wants is the want of God:” so wrote Channing in our own day, and the written and unwritten records of the Past bear witness that the words are true. Not alone in Chaldæa and Egypt, or on the hills of Greece, but in the tropical forests of Borneo and the fever haunts of the Mexican jungle, we find stone memorials which tell us how in fear or love the human heart sought God.

The interest and impressiveness of these silent records have been a powerful stimulus to research. We no longer look upon all non-biblical religions as curiosities, interesting only to the antiquary. The theological and philosophical bias, and the lack of sound historical method, which marred the scholarship of the eighteenth century, have been largely outgrown. The long delayed study of comparative religion is now taking its proper place. Man is revealed to us groping his uncertain way up those

“great altar stairs
That slope through darkness up to God.”

We see him, first, a savage, awestruck by the rushing

wind, the swift-flowing river, the swinging tides, the waving trees, worshipping the lightning and the thunder, the sun and the moon. The life and movement of Nature impress him with a sense of power unseen and often terrible. He peoples the woods with dryads, he endows trees with individual life, and worships in a sacred grove. God's temple, which "we figure to ourselves as a walled and built house, resolves itself, the further back we go, into a holy place, untouched by human hands, embowered and shut in by self-grown trees. There dwells the Deity, veiling his form in rustling foliage of the boughs ; there is the spot where the hunter must present to Him the game he has killed, and the herdsman his oxen, rams, and horses."*

Thus the trees of the forest enshrine a history of worship. But this forest worship, general in well-wooded countries, was, of course, far from exhausting the early ideas of God and His dwelling-place. Even in our own islands, we find that many rivers, like the Ribble and the Dee, preserve in their names the memory of old river gods, worshipped, as was Niagara, when, once a year, the Indians sent a virgin over the Falls in a frail birch canoe.

In the South of England surviving prejudices remind us that the flesh of the hare, goose, and domestic fowl

* Grimm.

was once forbidden on religious grounds. This dietary restriction, like the prohibition of "unclean" meats in the Old Testament, takes us back to the worship of the totem or sacred object from which the tribe believed itself to be descended.

Cruel or grotesque as now may seem the religions of man's spiritual infancy, they were the first stage in the slow evolution of worship from the dread of the strong to the adoration of the righteous. The story is of surpassing interest; for it tells not merely of man groping after God, but of the Father seeking his children.

The development is not indeed without interruption. Again and again there is stumbling on the altar stairs. We see simple faiths elaborated, and overlaid with ceremonial, until their life departs and the gaudy vestment alone is left. It was thus in Egypt. There, as elsewhere, the earliest religious ideas were probably expressed in Nature-worship; the vague, undetermined stage of spiritual life. Imagination, uncontrolled by reason, would develop the dæmonistic, magical rites observable to-day among the lowest African tribes. Each village, or group of villages, had its fetish or totem, its sacred cat, or hawk, or cow, and so the rabble of the Egyptian gods came into being. As the sense of national unity grew strong under the rule of the

Pharaohs, so also the different local religious ideas underwent some sort of fusion resulting in a national mythology, in which the local gods were brought under the dominance of Amen-Ra at Karnak. Then follows the decadence !

Probably neither the Eastern nor the Western church ever surpassed in splendour the service in the temple of the Father of Gods. No religious procession winding through the streets of Rome or Constantinople was ever more gorgeous than that which passed down the avenue of Sphinxes to the Nile, when the god in his golden bark was borne aloft by shaven priests in white garments, accompanied by every accessory of magnificence ; by dancing priestesses and musicians with their clashing instruments, by waving fans and clouds of incense. But there was little in which the common people might take part. The ancient totem of the village had become a mystery, hidden in the inner sanctuary from the eyes of the vulgar ; the service of the god was now the exclusive privilege of a class. Little wonder then that while the priests might cherish a mystic interpretation of the symbols of their worship, refining the grossness of an earlier age, the people ceased to believe in a ceremonial which for them had lost its meaning, and in which they hardly shared. This tendency to elaborate worship, and to create a separate class charged with the function of the temple, is almost universal. Living symbols become

outworn, and obscure what once they revealed, until the spirit of religion fails under a dead weight of perfunctory rites.

Of such symbols propitiatory sacrifice was perhaps the most significant. The chief deity was regarded as a king, the local gods as lords and ladies, and divine favour might only be obtained by presents. Homer declares that the gods are persuaded by gifts, while in Exodus xxiii., 15, we read that Jahveh must not be approached empty-handed.

In process of time these crude ideas lost their meaning for the worshipper, and sacrifice became a dead convention. But the Hebrew prophets hurled their denunciation against all sacrificial ceremonial, even when its meaning was still evident.* They grasped the truth that worship is inward and spiritual, the reverence of the soul for a righteous God. Ceremonial acts apart from moral conduct had for them no value whatever. They had a vision of that Christian ideal to which Paul gave noble utterance when he called upon men, by the mercies of God, to present to Him their bodies a living and acceptable sacrifice.†

* Amos protests in vigorous language : "Though ye offer me your burnt offerings and meal offerings I will not accept them ; neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts." See also Isaiah i., 10-17, and Micah vi., 6-8.

† It may be interesting here to recall a quotation of Porphyry from an earlier Greek writer : "We ought then having been united and made like to God to offer our own conduct as a holy sacrifice to him, the same being also a hymn and our salvation in passionless excellence of soul."

But, in spite of the prophets, the deep spirituality welling up in some post-exilic psalms* seems but a slender stream by the swollen river of legalism. On its return from Babylon the Jewish community had been re-organised by the priests, who combining the sacerdotal and the legal ruled henceforward over both the spiritual and material affairs of the people; and when in course of time their laxity provoked the rise of the Scribes, these authoritative interpreters only brought the Law into even greater prominence. In the days of Christ the Jewish nation had become a people of the Law, which commanded its enthusiastic obedience by the promise of future glory through faith in divine retribution. This faith in divine retribution was, says Schürer, "a mainspring of all zeal for the Law. Nay, the entire religious life of the Jewish people during this period revolved round these two poles: Fulfilment of the Law and Hope of Future Glory." As the motive was an external glory, so the result was an incredible externalising of the religious and moral life. "The value of Good is left out of account. Not the doing of good, as such, but merely formal accuracy in fulfilling the letter of the Law is the aim. And notwithstanding all zeal, nay, just because of it, true morality was the loser."†

* *E.g.* Psalm cxxxix.

† "His virtues were his pride; and that one vice
Made all his virtues gewgaws of no price."—COWPER, *Truth*.

It cannot, however, be maintained that such zeal was merely superficial.

The predominance of legalism seriously affected the Hebrew thought of God. The old free spirit of the son in the Father's House gave place to the hardening conception of the worker by contract, whose loveless labours the distant taskmaster was bound to reward. God was conceived as a far-off Oriental magnate, whose exclusive and artificial holiness must not be contaminated by the common and unclean things of a work-a-day world.*

Against the background, thus slightly outlined, let us set the scene at the well of Sychar.

The stillness of the mid-day heat ; the distant glimmer of white buildings buried in the green of figs and olives ; the mountain-pass parting Gerizim from the swelling shoulder of Mt. Ebal ; the broken dusty road from Jerusalem to Samaria ; the tired traveller sitting by the well ; the woman, with the stately walk of the Oriental, coming down from the scattered cottages of suburban Sychar ; the conversation ; the drawing of the water. The scene is so simple and so natural that the passer-by would hardly turn his head,

Paul, the Pharisee, was profoundly anxious to keep the ceremonial law. But his very earnestness drove him to seek the true morality of Christ ; and we may well believe that the sincere and deeply earnest souls found least satisfaction in their minutely ceremonial life.

* We may trace the false note of this Jewish conception of holiness in the conventional and artificial view of the "Sabbath" which still largely prevails.

unless, indeed, he recognised the traveller as a Jew, and wondered for a moment how a Jew could be in public converse with a Samaritan woman. The chance meeting is the merest incident in the day's travel, and yet how great is the outcome.

“Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life.”

“Sir,” exclaims the woman, “I perceive that thou art a prophet ;” and pointing up at Mt. Gerizim, she challenges him, “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain ; you, a Jew, say that it is in Jerusalem men ought to worship.”

“Woman believe me, neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father. The hour cometh, and now is, when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth ; for such does the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.”

The premise that God is spirit would be readily granted ; Jews and Samaritans alike believed in the non-material nature of God.* “But,” to quote Godet, “what is

* In a prayer attributed to Solomon—1 Kings, viii., 27—we read, “But will God in very deed dwell on the earth ? Behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain THEE, how much less this House that I have builded.”

absolutely new in this saying is the consequence which Jesus draws from this axiom in relation to worship. He sees springing up from the ancient notion, converted into reality by the Holy Spirit, a new people, who, in virtue of the *filial* spirit with which they shall be animated, will celebrate an unceasing and universal worship." Men, as children, are to worship their spiritual Father in spirit. It is the deepest element of the human soul which is to hold communion with the Divine. True worship can be rendered only in the inner sanctuary of the heart. "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost that is in you, which ye have from God?" * "The Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands." † "Behold the Kingdom of God is within you." ‡

No limit of place or time may be set to Christian worship. Not on Gerizim, not in Jerusalem, but in the heart of man stands the altar of God. "Every man has in his heart an altar, on which, if he invoke it in earnestness purity, and love, the Spirit of God will descend." §

Ceremonial rites are no condition of Divine favour. Madame Guyon has described ceremony as "only a jet thrown up from the worship of the spirit," and while Jesus lays emphasis on the spiritual nature of worship, he does not

* 1 Corinthians, vi., 19.

† Acts, vii., 48.

‡ Luke, xvii., 21.

§ Mazzini.

fix its outward form. If he nowhere expressly prohibit ceremonial, he nowhere enjoins it.* He visits Temple and Synagogue, and takes part in the great religious festivals, as a prophet with a message to deliver rather than as a participant. Indeed when he cleanses the Temple of its thieves he appeals to the prophets, whose protest against externalism we have already considered, quoting Isaiah—"My house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples." He thus ignores the general conception of the temple worship as culminating in ceremonial sacrifice, and elevates the spiritual exercise of prayer to a position of primary instead of secondary importance. But when he emphasises the importance of prayer, he establishes no rite! The context of "The Lord's Prayer" as well as the whole spirit of his teaching, precludes our reading into it any ceremonial injunction. We can only view its hurried recitation by a congregation as one of those vain repetitions which the Gentiles use, and as a direct contravention of the solemn command "After this *manner* pray ye."

Jesus does not once enjoin that observance of external rites which was a matter of supreme importance to the Jew.

*The injunction to the cleansed leper to show himself to the priest can hardly be strained into an acceptance of the priestly order, it is rather the establishment of official testimony to a great deed. When Jesus speaks of the gift offered at the altar, and of swearing by the altar, he acknowledges and accepts the temple ceremonial only in so far as he does not challenge it, but both are clearly references by way of illustration.

“There were in His day,” writes Principal Fairbairn,* “two traditional ideas of the religious life, the priest’s and the scribe’s ; but His did not conform to either. The priests made the temple, with its worship and priesthood, the great factor of religion. . . The holy man was the man who came often to the temple and made generous use of its priesthood, places, articles, and modes of worship. . . The ideal of the scribes was different, yet akin . . . The holy man of the scribe forgot no sacred day or solemn time, neglected no fast, gave alms of all he had, prayed by book, worshipped according to rule, and otherwise toiled and comported himself as became a man who lived by a written and traditional code.” Judged by every criterion of the Pharisee, Jesus was an irreligious man. “In His daily and familiar life they found none of the customary signs of religion . . . nay, they found not only these absent, but a conduct that seemed studiously to offend—kindly speech to Gentiles, association with publicans and sinners, unheard-of liberty allowed to His disciples and claimed for Himself on the Sabbath ; the right to do all this vindicated by the denial of the authority of tradition and the elders, and by the assertion of His own.”† He sets ceremonial observance aside with perfect inner freedom when he finds that it hinders the doing of his Father’s will. Against the Levitical idea of

* In the volume reviewed in this issue.

† *Ibid*, p. 26.

holiness Jesus sets the purity of the heart. He contrasts the moral inwardness of man's due attitude to the will of God with the mere externality of servile obedience. "His ideal of worship was filial love expressed in filial speech and conduct; and this love made all places sacred, all times holy, all service religious, all actions duties done to the Father in heaven."* A divine passion glows through the atmosphere of cold legality. The gulf between God and man, which the scribe had sought to widen, is bridged. The meagre conception of the Church as a temple of ritual, becomes that of a brotherhood for service, "where hand joins hand in helpfulness": a spiritual house built up of living stones, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices.

Dr. Fairbairn says, "It is a small thing, nay more, an easy thing, for a church to make out its historical continuity and catholicity—that is only a matter of deft criticism and courageous argument; but it is a great thing for any church to have created, or to be creating, a society correspondent to the ideal of Christ."†

How far has the Christian Church realised this ideal of its Master? In her earliest days the sense of brotherhood was strong. McGiffert, probably the greatest living authority on the Apostolic Age, dwells on the simplicity and warmth of early church life. "It would be a mistake to picture the

* *Ibid*, p. 38.

† *Ibid*, p. 2.

Christians as holding regular and formal services such as are held to-day. . . It was . . in their daily intercourse with one another and in the little family gatherings from house to house, that their Christian life found fullest expression and the sense of Christian brotherhood, which was all-controlling, had freest play.”*

“The most notable and characteristic feature of the Corinthian services, described by Paul, is the immediate activity and controlling influence of the Holy Spirit. It was supposed that those who took part in the Meetings did it, not on their own impulse, but under the impulse of the Spirit, and that all their utterances consequently were divinely inspired. Whoever had a psalm, or a teaching, or a revelation, or a tongue, or an interpretation, received it from the Spirit, and when he communicated it to his brethren, it was accepted as a divine and not a merely human utterance. It is in the light of this fact that the freedom which characterised the Corinthian services must be interpreted. The confinement of the right of participation to a special class, or to certain regularly appointed

* The question of the Lord's Supper is a subject by itself, and does not come within our province. Suffice it to say that there is no evidence whatever that the earliest disciples held a special service or partook of a special communion meal. McGiffert maintains that whenever they ate together they partook of the Lord's Supper, and looked back with tender hearts, in the breaking of their daily bread, to his life of service and of sacrifice.

individuals, was evidently quite unknown. Every Christian had the right to take part, and the woman's right was equal to the man's."*

The religious meetings of the Christians became in time more regular and stereotyped. In Rome, before the end of the first century, officials, appointed by the brethren, were in control of the services, and the movement which was ultimately to establish a hierarchy had begun. The history of the Church indeed is one of continual elaboration and absorption. The Greek orator becomes the Christian preacher, and the Christian sermon is modelled on the lines of the Hall of Rhetoric. The spiritual fervour of the early exhortations evaporates in the fine phrases of the sophist and rhetorician. Free participation in divine worship is increasingly restricted, till the priests perform before an audience the drama of the Mass. The Church under imperial patronage puts on earthly armour, she vies with ancient Egypt in the splendour of her ceremonial, and overlays the inward reality with a glitter of ritual.

There is a powerful passage in the Hibbert lectures of Dr. Hatch which we cannot forbear quoting :—"Christianity came into the educated world in the simple dress of a prophet

* McGiffert's History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.

of righteousness. It won that world by the stern reality of its life, by the subtle bonds of its brotherhood, by its divine message of consolation and of hope. Around it thronged the race of eloquent talkers who persuaded it to change its dress and to assimilate its language to their own. It seemed thereby to win a speedier and completer victory. But it purchased conquest at the price of reality. With that its progress stopped. There has been an element of sophistry in it ever since, and so far as in any age that element has been dominant, so far has the progress of Christianity been arrested. Its progress is arrested now because many of its preachers live in an unreal world. The truths they set forth are truths of utterance, rather than truths of their lives. But if Christianity is to be again the power that it was in its earliest ages, it must renounce its costly purchase. . . . The hope of Christianity is that the class which was artificially created may ultimately disappear, and that the sophistical preaching will melt as a transient mist before the preaching of the prophets of the ages to come, who, like the prophets of the ages that are long gone by, will speak 'only as the spirit gives them utterance.'"

The upheaval of the Reformation was in some measure a protest against that unreality which Dr. Hatch deplores ; a protest which is perhaps best illustrated by the teaching of George Fox. In the seventeenth century there

arose under his guidance a people who, with no original intention of founding a separate sect, ultimately became a distinct religious body, known to this day as the Society of Friends. Their testimony was against externalism. They met for worship with but little pre-arrangement. Those whose vocal ministry was acceptable were officially encouraged and called ministers, but with no rite of ordination, no priestly function, or special privileges. None were forbidden to speak or pray. All the men and women of the congregation shared alike in the responsibility of a priesthood free to all in the brotherhood of Christ. They met on a basis of silence, believing that there is a worship of the heart too profound for the utterance of the lips, though this silence in no way withheld liberty from those who had a message to deliver.* Symbolism in worship having shown a universal tendency to obscure the truth it once revealed, they rigidly excluded all forms, fearful lest the spirituality and inwardness of their worship might suffer. They built their meeting houses in simple fashion, that no sensuous æsthetic delight in outward beauty might displace

* It should be remembered that the modern objection to singing had no part in the original protest of the Society of Friends. A minute of 1675 in the manuscript Book of Discipline bids Friends not to quench or discourage "Reverant singing, breathing forth an Heavenly sound of Joy with Grace, with the Spirit and with Understanding . . . to Edification and comfort in the Church of Christ." Singing can only be inconsistent with spiritual worship when it is professional or insincere.

the dependence on the inward light in the temple not made with hands. The underlying principle of their worship was the responsibility and the priesthood of each worshipper, and his immediate dependence upon the Spirit of God. Worship cannot be "done by proxy." W. E. Gladstone has spoken of "the work of divine worship," "of the sustained mental effort necessary to complete the act wherein every Christian is a priest." Upon this truth, which a spiritually indolent age seems eager to forget, William Penn long ago laid emphasis. He says :—"If you would know God and worship and serve God as you should do, you must come to the means he has ordained and given for that purpose. Some seek it in books, some in learned men ; but what they look for is IN THEMSELVES, though not of themselves, but they overlook it. The voice is too still, the seed too small, and the light shineth in darkness. Wherefore, O Friends, turn in, turn in, I beseech you ! There you want Christ, and there you must find Him ; and, blessed be God, there you may find Him. Seek and you shall find ; I testify for God." "He who only hears," says Prof. Drummond, "leaves life and character in arrears, while truth and knowledge may seem to increase. His organism acquires a growing immobility, and finally exists in a state of entire intellectual helplessness and inertia. . . What costs nothing can come to nothing. . . Such an one becomes at last the listless, useless, pampered parasite of the pew. . . his will unbraced, his crude soul unquickened and unimproved."

At the close of the nineteenth century we are face to face with a movement which lays extreme emphasis on ritual. Does the present generation of Englishmen recognise what that emphasis involves? Can history show a single instance of ritualistic development unaccompanied by the *ultimate* spiritual enfeeblement of the worshipper, and the creation of a priestly class? Can the teaching of Jesus be reconciled with a sacerdotalism which re-establishes in the supreme place that practice of ceremonial sacrifice which was condemned by the prophets and set aside by Christ? Can we find even a trace of Christ's teaching in the denial to the layman of access to the Holiest save through the mediation of the priest? These are urgent questions. We believe that this movement now agitating the Anglican Church is but a fresh illustration of those retrograde tendencies in the practice of worship, which, as we have seen, assert themselves in Pagan and Christian churches alike.

God is Spirit and we must worship Him in spirit. To whatever religious denomination we may belong, and this is no mere sectarian question, true spiritual inwardness is clearly essential. The worshipper must recognise his own priesthood; he must seek to come into living communion with the Father of Spirits; he must take his own share in the work of worship. He must not contemplate divine service as a mere propitiatory gift offered to God for his

own protection, for

. . . "Book and Church and Day are given
For Man, not God—for Earth, not Heaven."

He must not merely repeat in hymn or prayer the words of another ; he must think his own thoughts, he must make the words his own. Praise has its place, the glad overflowing of a thankful heart, but God's House is also the House of Prayer.

We come back to the beginning of our discussion. "*The profoundest of all human wants is the want of God.*" Prayer must be, not the vain repetition of the Gentile, but the passionate cry of the soul that seeks a knowledge of God, the reverent concentration of the whole inner being upon its supreme ideal, that movement of the soul which leads it into the light of love and the presence of the righteous Father. We stand in sore need of such prayer in our modern life, and of the conscious unity with God in thought and action which is its benediction. There is a danger that we may get further away from Him than the trembling savage who heard His voice in the rustling branches. After setting forth the testimony to man's sense of the Divine, from the very beginning of self-conscious life, must the historian write down the nineteenth century as so rich and busy that it forgot "the King Eternal, immortal, invisible" ?

A recent writer says,* "Have a soul of your own. Be your true self. Think, realise, reflect, until you have a

* Horatio Dresser.—"The Power of Silence."

measure of unborrowed conviction, which establishes a centre of repose, and is a source of happiness and contentment—a centre which yields to no outer tumult, but is ever receptive to the Divine Self ; which never harbours fear or doubt, no matter what the wavering self may say ; which never wavers, never forgets that the individual belongs to the Universal, never relaxes its hold of the deepest, the truest, the most spiritual in life, come what may, be it sorrow, illness, or any calamity which life may bring ; a centre which you will probably discover at last rests on the love of God for its strength, making it part of eternity and of all power and substance, though it be but a point in the infinite whole. And, when you lose this poise, regain it, as though you would say, ‘Sit still, my soul ; thou at least must not lose thy composure nor thy awareness of the eternal presence of God.’”

Even silent worship, if it be truly spiritual, does not lack the unifying element of fellowship. We remember Robert Barclay’s beautiful tribute to its influence :—“When I came into the Silent Assemblies of God’s People, I felt a secret power among them, which touched my heart ; and, as I gave way unto it, I found the Evil weakening in me, and the Good raised up.”

There is a strong tendency to ignore this value of fellowship in worship. Some claim that they can worship best alone upon the hills or in the fields. No spot is

more sacred than another, for the whole world is consecrated by the presence of God,—

Where'er they seek Thee Thou art found,
And every place is hallowed ground.

But, while lonely worship has its place, we set ourselves against the whole teaching of Christ if we deny the place of fellowship in worship. True worship is never selfish. In George Eliot's words "One wants a temple besides the outdoor temple,—a place where human beings do not ramble apart but *meets* with a common impulse." And as true worship can never be selfish, so, though it may have in it an element of mysticism, it will never be impractical. Divine service consists not in ceremonial, nor yet wholly in the gratification of personal desires after the infinite, but in labour for the Brotherhood.

The work of Jesus Christ must be the work of His Church. Such work is worship. Not the intoning of the Lord's Prayer, but the passionate longing of men, fired by the vision of Christ and sustained by His fellowship, to do the Father's will on Earth as it is done in Heaven.

II.

Reviews.

I.

F. BEYSCHLAG'S THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

WHEN Jesus of Nazareth struck the barren Judaism of his time with the impact of his divine personality, a vast religious force was generated. This ethical and spiritual impulse, which has dominated and modified the whole of succeeding history, still exists, and still testifies by its nature to its divine origin.

The book before us is a serious and honest attempt to trace this stream to its source, to get behind the teaching of the Churches, and to create for us an atmosphere of New Testament thought and feeling. It aims, in short, at teaching us not what we have to believe about Jesus and his Apostles, but what they themselves believed about the eternal verities, and how they regarded the developments of their age. This is what we are to understand by the title—"New Testament Theology." Strictly speaking, of course, the Bible contains no theology, that is, it sets forth no scientific doctrine of divine things; it contains religion as distinct from theology. We may, however, use the term in

* *New Testament Theology*—by F. Beyschlag. 2 vols, 18/- net. Translated by Rev. Neil Buchanan. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

a wider sense to signify that doctrinal teaching which is the basis of all religion ; and this is what our author has done.

We recognise at once that F. Beyschlag is no superficial student. He moves about in the New Testament writings as one who has made them his own by the careful study of a lifetime. Taking a large canvas for a great design, he has with German thoroughness set himself to work through the whole of the New Testament, and to give us "a historical account of the Teaching of Jesus and of primitive Christianity according to New Testament sources." We naturally turn to the main topic, the teaching of Jesus, which occupies the greater part of the first volume, and we soon become conscious of a note of originality in the treatment of the subject. It is not so much what Jesus taught, as what Jesus thought, which interests our author. The mental standpoint, the spiritual development, the inner struggles and the practical difficulties of the Saviour are delineated with painstaking effect, until the Christ of the Gospel stands before us as a living person. We realize him, sympathize with him, believe in him as never before. This is no mean achievement ; such a presentment as this has power to quicken and enrich the spiritual life, and the man who can do this for us deserves our warmest gratitude.

The scope of this review hardly admits of quotations,

and, interesting as it would be to trace out the developments which certain ideas receive in this work, it is only in the merest outline that anything of the kind can be attempted. The setting forth of the nature of the Kingdom of God of course bulks largely in the teaching of our Lord, and, as the clear incisive sentences follow one another, we recognize how the Prophetic ideal of that kingdom—as one of strength and of conquering as well as of purifying power—was realised by the Baptist as a more spiritual and inward force. But we see, also, how John erred by imagining that the inauguration and the perfection of the kingdom would immediately coincide, and how it was reserved for Jesus to grasp the progressiveness of the growth of the Kingdom of God, in virtue of which it cannot fall from heaven ready-made but must develop itself in the hearts of men, and in the history of the world. The double meaning which the phrase assumed in the mind of Jesus is clearly shewn. It is with Him both a gift to be received and also a commonwealth to be formed and entered (Mark x. 15). With Jesus the kingdom is so far present that a man may receive it, but is still future in the sense that we are yet to be received into it, and the former is the condition of the latter.

The saving significance of the death of Christ is dwelt upon with much force. We are led to see how, as the clouds of misunderstanding and hatred gathered round Him, Jesus perceived with ever increasing clearness that

he might accomplish by dying what he had only prepared for by living. His offering of Himself was a true atonement, taking away the sins of many; not certainly in the legal sense of bearing the punishment they deserved, but in the dynamic sense of a power to remove sin and to efface it in the sight of God, who no longer imputes the broken and uprooted sin. And His death is throughout closely connected with that ceremony which foreshadowed it,—the broken bread and the outpoured wine. These symbols are regarded as expressing the idea that the life of Jesus given up to, but not abiding in, death, must be inwardly appropriated by his disciples and become food for their inner life, and that thus His surrender to death may serve for their reconciliation and deliverance.

Before leaving this part of the subject we must however frankly acknowledge that there are grave defects in the portraiture of Christ, and that with all his excellences F. Beyschlag is not a guide to be followed unreservedly. The human personality of Jesus with him so overshadows the divine, that the latter is practically ignored and sometimes even categorically denied. The pre-existence of the Saviour, except in the ideal counsels of the Most High, presents to him such insuperable difficulties that several paragraphs of ingenious arguments are devoted to explaining it away. This is the more strange because he freely allows the miraculous nature of the Resurrection, saying: "It is wasted effort to try to explain the

Resurrection, on purely subjective, psychological, or pathological grounds. Only as a truly objective supernatural event can it take its place in the historical and psychological conditions of the time."

A great part of the second volume is devoted to an account of the Pauline system. F. Beyschlag is an enthusiastic admirer of Paul. He sees in him the only one able to grasp and formulate the experience of salvation common to all the disciples. He it was who transformed facts into ideas, and so gave an enduring form to the new religion. To this apostle the death of Christ appears as an infinite pledge, given by God to the world, of His desire to forgive and of his purpose to reconcile. He regards it not as a completed fact, but as an operative power. Justification is God counting for righteousness that which contains the vital germ of righteousness. He takes growing for being, and He can do this because he regards the process of man's sanctification from the standpoint of eternity.

These volumes, even in the admirably executed English translation, are by no means easy reading. The style, although clear and logical, is scholastic and highly technical. Occasionally it becomes controversial, sometimes even repellant in its nature. From time to time, as has been said, we come upon assumptions and conclusions which we are unable to accept ; sometimes we are even shocked

and grieved. But, in spite of these blemishes and drawbacks, the work as a whole is a monumental and even an epoch-making achievement of research and scholarship. Those who, carefully guarding their own individuality, and refusing to surrender their right of private judgment, will patiently and carefully work through these pages, can hardly fail to be rewarded with an altogether fresh view, not only of the unity but also of the continuity of Gospel truth. To them the New Testament writings will group themselves as an ordered whole. The various standpoints of the inspired writers will become clear, and they will see how circumstances and characteristics shaped the differing presentments of truth. Above all the personality of Jesus Christ will stand out with something of the freshness and power of a new revelation; and in thus striving to increase in knowledge, it may well be that a tide of reverence and love will sweep over the soul lifting it ever to higher levels of consecration and service.

MARY ANNE WALLIS.

II.

PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN'S CATHOLICISM : ROMAN AND ANGLICAN.*

THIS book is written with a singular felicity which makes it at once timely and of permanent importance. While it is a justification of Protestant Nonconformity and a careful exposition of the dangers involved in sectarian and sacerdotal Catholicism, Dr. Fairbairn's work is not merely controversial. It has no fellowship with that narrow and unimaginative dissent which supposes itself to be a positive force.

He appeals from the churches to Christ, he appeals also to the spirit of Christ in the churches ; and his earnest, positive criticism of mischievous method and erroneous doctrine, is always accompanied by cordial appreciation of true Evangelicalism wherever it is manifested.

The volume is of special value to Friends, for no Quaker statement has defined with greater accuracy the position they should hold in the present religious crisis.

* *Catholicism : Roman and Anglican.* By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D. Hodder & Stoughton, 7/6.

This book is a study of the Anglo-Catholic revival, from the Emancipation Bill and the publication of Tracts for the Times, down to the present day. The ground covered is so wide and the pages so full of suggestive thought, that we can only call attention to certain passages of special importance, leaving the book itself open for our readers.

Dr. Fairbairn's main premise is that Christ's new religion was essentially non-sacerdotal, and the Church He founded in no sense a clerical hierarchy, or priest-governed kingdom. The Holy Catholic Church, whatever we mean by the phrase, is still a different conception from that Kingdom of God which Christ came to found, and for which the Church of Christ exists. The Church exists for religion, not religion for the Church. But religion is the imitation of Christ by men "who so love the divine will as to labour to bring everything in themselves and in society into harmony with it." (p. 19.)

The Church then "is a society which seeks to realize the beautiful ideal of a family of God, or a household of faith, or a brotherhood of man" (p. 347). There is no place in it for priests or priestcraft. Its temple is man. Divine service is no sacerdotal ceremonial, but the service of man. "The progress of man and the Church of God are two kindred things" (p. 91.) The authority of the Church must be based not on a formal Apostolical

succession, but on its persistence in the active spirit of Christ and His Apostles. It must bear this test—"Has the Church made the people among whom it has lived fulfil, individually, and collectively, Christ's ideal, or approximate to the fulfilment of it?" (p. 33.)

As Friends we may begin by applying this to our own Society. How far is it the representative of Jesus upon earth? How far are we accomplishing the ends which He had in view—"the salvation of the world and its redemption from the pain under which it has travailed from creation until now?" For to that end is all worship, and all regenerate spirits labour for that. "The churches that convert most men, *and best use the men they have converted*, realize religion in the most efficient way." (p. 43.)

In our age unbelief is among the greatest hindrances to conversion, and yet "not so much unbelief as want of a belief" (p. 339), and the want of relevant Christian doctrine is not met by the Anglican revival. It reverts instead to mediæval ideals, dissociating itself alike from modern thought and from primitive Christianity. Dr. Fairbairn considers the mediævalism of the Church as largely responsible for the Nihilisms and Secularisms of the age. In a magnificent passage, too long to quote, he records the message of the Age to the Church, its burden being "Is there any power within you that can make

the Christian Faith credible to the living reason and authoritative to the living conscience?" (p. 336.) Of doubt he says: "Doubt never appears without [a] reason; and the removal of the reason is the only real way to the removal of the doubt." (p. 61.) "The primary right of every man is to the truth, and the best truth his teachers can give him; the primary duty of the teacher, especially of the collective teacher called the Church, is to communicate the truth, not speaking with authority or certainty where certainty is not." (p. 60.)

But Catholicism is based on authority and tradition, not upon reason. Protestantism accepts human reason as part of the Divine reason, and acknowledges no dogmatic authority. Enlightened study of the Bible, by destroying the dogma of an infallible book, has taken some who seek such external authority back into the arms of the one self-styled Infallible Church. Lack of moral courage and inability to find God in the Temple of their own heart or the greater Temple of Humanity drives men to-day, as it drove Newman, to Rome. "But the man who accepts Authority because he dare not trust his intellect, lest it should lead him into Atheism, is vanquished by the Atheism he fears." (p. 137.) In the struggle against Catholicism a strong element in the Nonconformist Churches seems to be tending towards the extreme Protestantism of Friends, with its frank reliance upon the Spirit of Truth, and the Inner Witness of God.

The rise, development, and character of that movement among High Anglicans which at the present time threatens the English Church with disruption, is carefully followed. "Where the pure preaching of the Word once stood, the due administration of the sacraments now stands. To it an authorised priesthood is necessary; without it there can be no Eucharist, in other hands the Supper is no sacrament or efficacious means of grace." (p. 327.) The theory of the new ritualism is thus succinctly stated:— "Without the apostolic authority no bishop; without the bishop no priest; without the priest no sacrament; without the sacrament no church; without the church no means of grace, no mediation or reconciliation through Christ of man with God. Two things are essential to the Church, the clergy and the sacraments; and of these the clergy are the greater. . . They are therefore in a most real sense of the essence of the church, while the people are but an accident." (p. 327-8.)

But with all their pretensions many of the new ritualists are men of power. They are evangelical in the broad sense, and "while merely academic claims are heard with scorn, claims supported by devoted lives, . . . are . . . patiently endured." (330.) And yet sacerdotalism means nothing less than the denial of the sufficiency of Jesus as our only high-priest. It is professionalism in religion; it is the acknowledgment of an order of superhuman men as God's agents upon earth; and it is, at last, the substitution of

a human ecclesiastical institution for the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost. Under ritualism sacraments tend to take the place of individual faith; the mysteries of the spirit are not realized but materialized.

But a true Catholicism is needed, and "there is surely a nobler Catholicism . . . one not of Rome, but of man, based not upon the excommunication of the reason, but on the reconciliation of the whole nature, intellect, conscience, heart, will to God and His truth." (p. 131.)

THE EDITORS.

“And all the windows of my heart I open to the day.”—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.

REVIEW :

THE TEMPERANCE PROBLEM.—

R. SPENCE WATSON.

April, 1899.

Price 4d.

Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

NOTE.—The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

I.

The Stewardship of Wealth.

THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.

“**W**HEN I first realized the squalid poverty of a great city,” writes the author of *Progress and Poverty*, “it appalled and tormented me, and would not let me rest for thinking of what caused it, and how it could be cured. But out of this inquiry has come to me something I did not think to find, and a faith that was dead revives.”

These are the words of one who, whatever his political theories, was filled with a divine compassion for the poor and the oppressed. Their burden would not let him rest. He gave himself to the problem of poverty. His was the true philanthropy, the personal charity of Jesus. He devoted all his faculties, and thus truly laid down his life, for the helpless and ignorant, whom he chose to be his friends.

One recalls, though with a difference, Arnold's words of his fellow-poet Clough, who "of his own will went away,"—

It irk'd him to be here, he could not rest.

He loved each simple joy the country yields,
He loved his mates ; but yet he could not keep

(For that a shadow lower'd on the fields)

Here with the shepherds and the silly sheep.

Some life of men unblest

He knew, which made him droop, and fill'd his head.

He went ; his piping took a troubled sound

Of storms that rage outside our happy ground ;

He could not wait their passing, he is dead.

By varying and often conflicting methods, such men unite to carry on the work begun by Christ. They seek to relieve the oppressed and remove oppression, to establish and extend the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in heaven. In order that we may enter into this active spirit of compassion, we, of the comfortable classes, need a vivid realization of "the shadow lowering on the fields," and of that "life of men unblest," with its "troubled sound of storms that rage outside our happy ground." We need to feel the terrible meaning both of spiritual and of material poverty.

The meaning of poverty. Material poverty means an insufficient and precarious subsistence. In other words, it means low vital force, physical exhaustion and the resultant craving for unhealthy excitement, a high death rate, joyless surroundings, a stunted mind, and sometimes the choice

between vice and starvation.* It means disease, misery, and

*As witness the following facts taken from Arthur Sherwell's *Life in West London*, 2nd edition :—

One-and-a-quarter millions, or nearly 30 per cent., of the population of London, live in an overcrowded condition (two or more persons living in a single room).

In a district where the population so overcrowded does not exceed 10 per cent. of the whole, the death rate from "all causes" in 1894 was 12·71 per 1,000.

In a district where that proportion exceeds 35 per cent. the death rate rose to 21·85 per 1,000.

Where it reaches 55 per cent. the death rate was 27·4 per 1,000.

Phthisis kills 0·9 per 1,000 in Hampstead (15 per cent. overcrowded).

" " 2·3 " in St. George's-in-the-East (55 per cent. overcrowded).

Zymotic (infectious) diseases kill 1·38 per 1,000 in Hampstead.

" " " " 4·95 per 1,000 in St. George's-in-the-East.

Infant mortality at Hampstead ... 113 per 1,000 births.

" " St. George's-in-the-East 185 "

The rents of London have risen 150 per cent. in fifty years. Over large districts they now average about 6s. a room per week. In the Peabody Buildings they are only from 2s. to 3s. per room. As a consequence of high rents nearly 400,000 Londoners are living in one-room tenements. "It is no wonder if sometimes the children's moral ideas become as fetid as the air of the crowded room in which the people work and sleep and live" (p. 124). "Morals fluctuate with trade" (p. 146).

These statistics relate to what is perhaps the cruellest poverty in the world. But exceptional as they are, they may serve to remind us that in spite of the remarkable increase of comfort among the artizan classes during the last two generations, so patent to everyone, the evils of poverty do still exist. While it is possible that the century has seen a decrease in the proportion of the poor to the total population of England, the best authorities affirm that their actual number increases. Even if it were not so, the condition of the working classes at the beginning of this century was exceptionally bad, and we can hardly plume ourselves upon the fact that they have shared, to some minor extent, in the general prosperity. The enormous increase in the country's wealth must be kept in mind, and in face of it the urgent problems of poverty should shame the most complacent optimist into activity.

sin. Such poverty is the normal condition of nearly one-third of the total population of London alone.* The picture of spiritual poverty which these conditions suggest, is terrible.

That is surely a hard or a dull heart which is not touched and saddened by the sight of city children. "Stronger than all combinations of capital, wiser than all the Committees representative of labour, [is] the simple need and hunger of the human heart," writes Edward Carpenter. "The falsehood of a gorged and satiated society, curls and shrivels together like a withered leaf, before the forces which lie dormant in the pale and wistful face of a little child."

The precocious, stunted little Arabs of our streets, are sufficient evidence of our imperfect social system. For our own children we demand the benefit of the supreme "instruments of production," the agencies of mental and moral development. But the birthright to all that physical, mental, and moral culture which goes to make life sane, wholesome, and complete, should not be confined to a particular class. By what right are the opportunities for this large culture given to our children and withheld from

*Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People*. "The poor" are those whose average weekly earnings per family do not exceed 21s. This applies to London; in other districts local economic conditions of life will necessarily qualify the figure here quoted.

others? How does the present harsh inequality of opportunity, harmonize with the equal love of God to men? These questions seem to call for individual attention, and indicate a profound need for some inspired message.

What poverty means, is explained by Professor Marshall at the commencement of his *Principles of Economics* :—
“Those who have been called the Residuum of our large towns have little opportunity for friendship; they know nothing of the decencies and the quiet, and very little even of the unity, of family life, and religion often fails to reach them. No doubt their physical, mental, and moral ill-health is partly due to other causes than poverty, but it is the chief cause.”

According, then, to our great economist, the disease, misery, and vice of the poor, find their “chief cause” in poverty. Recent scientific investigation has gone far to prove that, in the large majority of cases, it is not drink, gambling, thriftlessness, or vice; but high rents; irregular employment; and the ill-health caused by exhausting hours of labour, unsanitary workshops and homes, and dangerous trades, which make poverty.

If this be so—and we may accept the evidence as presumptive proof—we must give up the conception that all poverty is an ordinance of God. The causes of poverty enumerated—high rents, irregular wages, and the rest—can hardly be regarded as a permanent

part of the Divine plan. But to some it appears as though the Christian virtues of philanthropy and charity, were dependent upon the continuance of poverty. It has too often been described as a necessary evil, and even invested with an almost sacred character as affording a special field for the somewhat exotic virtues of the alms-giving rich.

I heard a devil curse
Over the heath and furse—
“Mercy could be no more
If there were nobody poor,
And pity no more could be
If all were happy as ye ;
And mutual fear brings peace.
Misery’s increase
Are mercy, pity, peace.”

That blighting devil’s curse which William Blake heard in England a hundred years ago must be recognized as such in England to-day. The whole paralyzing conception of “necessary evil” is so alien to the triumphant faith of the Saviour of men, that we can regard it only as latent blasphemy.

Although many men and women have undoubtedly become poor through their own folly and vice, the great majority are poor through causes beyond their own control. We cannot comfortably explain away their poverty as God’s righteous punishment upon their sins ; for even in the case of the vicious poor, their degradation is frequently the direct fruit of poverty. Should there be any truth in the Northern

Farmer's exaggerated statement that "the poor in a loomp is bad," their sins must often be laid at the door of those wealthy and honoured citizens who make them and keep them poor. For "the destruction of the poor is their poverty." (Prov. x. 15.)

Broadly speaking, you will not make men saints in spirit while you keep them brutes in body. But no general improvement can come, save through the conversion of public opinion from its present low commercial ideals to the ideal of Christ; and this change depends upon the stirring of the individual conscience. There should be no opposition between religion and reform, for economic reforms are a part of the spiritual regeneration of the race. The connection between the spiritual and the practical, is vital to both.

Poverty is very largely the result of social sin, its root lies in the selfish abuse of privilege; but this social sin is a common sin in which the individual shares. Selfishness, in whatever form it occurs, is individual; and yet it may of course be embodied in social conventions, customs, laws and ideals. Material and spiritual poverty, social and individual sin, are all inter-dependent.

Irresponsibility. The poor, as a class, are the victims of selfish power: for their permanent relief, it is necessary that the spirit of oppression should be conquered. The

irresponsible attitude of the privileged classes towards their wealth,—irresponsible landlords, irresponsible employers, irresponsible purchasers,* irresponsible investors, with irresponsible churches and an irresponsible public opinion,—it is this irresponsibility which makes the present condition of society possible.

In our cities, where poverty is greatest and help most needed, irresponsibility prevails. Industrialism has broken the old feudal bonds. All over the world it is building vast cities of strangers. No men are greater aliens than those who live next door to each other in San Francisco or London. In this rush of life a man has no time to “look upon his neighbour’s good.” Only the excitement of some awful tragedy, breaks through that indifference which effectually thickens our nine-inch walls of partition. One is often glad of the secure solitude a great city affords: nobody asks what you are doing; you are free from public opinion; you need fear no parish microscope. But this very indifference is the bane of city life. It is not so much a cosmopolitan tolerance, as a selfish irresponsibility. And

* As purchasers, we become responsible directly we hear of any abuse in the making of an article. While it is impossible for us to hunt out every abuse which exists, we must not perpetuate any of which we have knowledge. Newspapers and magazines are doing much to increase our social responsibility by the exposure of bad trades and workshops. But apart from them, we ourselves are bound to enquire into the character of the places where we frequently deal, and to encourage those which offer improved conditions of life to the workers.

among Christians, irresponsibility can only be regarded as immoral, for it is the denial of that Holy Spirit which convinces men of Brotherhood.

The separation of the poor and rich into different districts, fosters the selfish ignorance of those who are only too ready to forget the poverty of the slums. And behind this ignorance irresponsibility buttresses itself, in an optimism which declares of this, as of every other pressing problem, "*solvitur ambulando*—poverty is dying out." But poverty is not dying out, and will never show symptoms of permanent diminution while this placid optimism prevails.

It is the misfortune of efforts for social amelioration that they are sometimes degraded to the level of a fashionable craze. We have no sympathy with those who merely take up social reform as a conscience-narcotic. Nor do we believe that dabbling in beaten copper-work will dispel the darkness of human misery. On the other hand we cannot join in the common sneer at those who seek, by fostering a love of the beautiful in nature and art, to bring colour into the grey skies of a laborious life. The kind of work which is associated in our minds with Toynbee Hall, is certainly not the least valuable part of our national education, since it tends to redeem the worker from the degradation ensuing upon loveless toil and joyless surroundings. "Life without industry," writes Ruskin in his *Lectures on Art*, "is guilt, but industry without art is brutality."

That mass of human misery which John Woolman beheld in his vision as being "of a dull gloomy colour between the south and the east," grows in magnitude. The pathos of overworked childhood and of destitute old-age,* has so troubled the prevailing apathy, that old-age pensions and the problem of "half-timers," are now subjects of parliamentary debate.

Such apathy is generally attributed, and not without some cause, to the violence of certain political theorists. The Socialists, who have felt the compassion for poverty more than perhaps any other body of men in our day, have sometimes appeared to hinder reform in favour of revolution. The Socialist has too often shown a lack of sanity and a failure to recognize facts. He has put forward his theory as a jumping pole which will land society at large

* A recent report compiled by Dr. Macnamara (*Daily Chronicle*, February 14th, 1899) for the London School Board, is painfully suggestive. Although the returns from the schools are but meagre, only one-quarter having reported, if these are a fair sample of the whole there must be something like 10,000 children in London alone who do nineteen or more hours of work (outside their own homes and beside their school-work) every week. In one case, a boy who is eleven years old and in Standard IV., is working fifty-seven hours a week.

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking in the House of Commons (March 23rd, 1899), said that of the industrial classes "nearly one in two are destitute when they reach the age of sixty-five . . . This extraordinary amount of old-age pauperism is not due to drink or idleness or culpable improvidence. . . . No statesman and no politician can afford to neglect such a state of things."

into the millennium. And this kind of teaching has alienated cautious minds from the cause of progress, and driven the less generous inquirer back into a grosser cynicism.

But, if we may compare two very different movements, Socialism has, in its spirit at least, been the Methodism of our century in political life. It is a prelude to the profound evangelical awakening of the social conscience, which we believe to be upon us. Even if we condemn the dogmas and formulas of Socialism as crude and unpractical, they at least represent valuable pioneer work, and the wiser heads in the Socialist party hardly claim more than this. But the eager, investigating, reforming, responsible spirit of Socialism, is the healthiest spirit in modern politics. It is only the Spirit of Truth, armed with the sword of undeniable evidence, that can slay the great Beast Do-nothing. Doctrinaire philosophies are valueless.

Luxury. It is not usual to associate the name of John Woolman with the scientific spirit, but few observers have been more patient and free from prejudice. The purity of his perception made many truths evident to him which have since been acknowledged and established by the labours of political economists. He saw that "every degree of luxury, of what kind soever, hath some connection with unnecessary labour," by drawing work away from useful to useless fields; and that the dealing in such luxuries, or superfluities, brought a dimness over the eyes

of the spirit. He also recognized the moral degradation which results from unproductive labour.

Most Friends must now be familiar with the truth that luxury and poverty cannot be dissociated.* Singular evidence will be found in Arthur Sherwell's little book on *Life in West London*,† where it is shown by the careful marshalling of facts that the fashionable and vicious luxury of Kensington and Piccadilly, find their inevitable consequence in the destitute misery and vice of Soho.

Luxury quenches the spirit. It hinders service, standing in our lives between God and the salvation of the world. Luxury is the "unprofitable servant." It is irresponsible power, and unredeemed privilege. Luxury, as the selfishness of capital or wealth, is the oppressor of the poor. Luxury does not consist in things, nor in the ownership of things, but in the manner of their use. And because it is a spiritual rather than a material evil it is the manifest duty of the churches to denounce it, and to make no compromise with it whatever.

That this duty has been in any measure fulfilled, we cannot admit. We have been making friends with the "Mammon of unrighteousness." We have tackled "the sins o' the Wo'ld, an' not the faults o' the Squire," in accordance with the shrewd advice of Tennyson's Churchwarden.

*It seems unnecessary to re-state the well-worn proofs in this place.

† Methuen & Co. 2/6.

Have not Friends sometimes been guilty with the rest, of doing homage to the power of wealth?—of a social snobbishness which sets up some golden image, some other standard of worth than likeness to Jesus Christ—that snobbishness which is nothing else than the spirit of idolatry in modern life?

Isaiah would not miss his mark to-day; but the sins of luxury have not received that denunciation from Minister or Ministering Friend, which Christ and the Prophets poured on them. Self-indulgence is still a sin whose wages are death, and whose punishment falls on the sinner's children and his children's children. The rich man may deem he escapes, but the consequences of luxury are cumulative, and often overtake his family in double measure.

Wealth as a stewardship. In any consideration of the right use of wealth, the just acquisition of that wealth is pre-supposed. One cannot speak of a stewardship of stolen goods; and it must be freely acknowledged that no generosity in giving can ever remedy injustice in acquiring wealth. To quote George Adam Smith,—“Unless a man see and reverence beauty in the very workshop and office of his business; unless he feel those whom he meets there, his employees and his customers, as his brethren; unless he keep his business methods free from fraud, and honestly recognize his gains as a trust

from the Lord; then no amount of devotion *elsewhere* to the fine arts, nor perseverance in philanthropy, nor fondness for the Church evinced by ever so large subscriptions, will deliver him from the devil of mercenariness."

What stewardship can there be in wealth obtained from the oppressive and inflated rents of city property? Or in that made by gambling on stock exchange and market? Or by speculative and unscrupulous company-promoting?

All forms of business which depend for their profits upon untruthful advertising, or upon the payment of insufficient wages, or upon unhealthy workrooms, must be regarded as immoral and illegitimate sources of wealth.

Fortunes which have in any way brought impoverishment and oppression upon others, cannot be regarded as a stewardship from God.

Let the churches at least refuse to receive any part of such wealth. Let them refuse in any way to absolve the holders of these fraudulent fortunes from the law of simple justice, which demands that they shall, in honest repentance, pay all that they owe. How can a church hope for spiritual power, if its subscriptions are a part of wealth which is wrung from the poor, in defiance of all the teaching of all the prophets?

But we believe that there is wealth amongst us which has been legitimately obtained, and which may therefore be rightly regarded as a stewardship.

Such wealth is in no wise a tyranny if, "smit with freer light," it "fatten lower lands." "Some enjoy a greater share of this world than others," wrote Woolman, "and while those possessions are faithfully improved for the good of the whole, it agrees with equity." "Men who have great estates stand in a place of trust." The whole teaching of Woolman with regard to wealth and commerce, is put into one beautiful thought,—“to turn all we possess into the channel of universal love.” This we believe to be the spiritual and catholic interpretation of that often-quoted word of Jesus to the young ruler. For Christ has not said that a rich man cannot enter the Kingdom ; but “how hard is it for those who trust in riches” to enter. And it is easy for the rich to trust in their riches, as though they must be of some spiritual value in the sight of God, easy for those who have material wealth, but still easier for those who have great mental possessions.

Tennyson's allegory of that "sinful soul possess'd of many gifts" in *The Palace of Art*, will naturally suggest itself to many :—

“I built myself a lordly pleasure house,
Wherein at ease for aye to dwell ;
I said, ‘O Soul, make merry and carouse,
Dear Soul, *for all is well.*’”

When "the riddle of the painful earth flashed through
her as she sat alone,"

"'What, is not this my place of strength,' she said,
'My spacious mansion built for me,
Whereof the strong foundation-stones were laid
Since my first memory?'"

In the last verse is the whole conception of the stewardship
of wealth, when, the pride of life being broken, and the sin
of selfishness made plain, the soul renounces all :—

"'Yet pull not down my palace towers, that are
So lightly, beautifully built ;
Perchance I may return with others there,
When I have purged my guilt.'"

Wealth and leisure are either a stewardship or a tyranny ;
either they are instruments of the divine, or of the worldly,
spirit. And the churches must speak the words of Christ
on this matter, if they are to regain their lost ascendancy
over the minds of men. They must assert fearlessly, and
continually, the cardinal Christian teaching of the stewardship
of life. The rich man must be plainly told that his wealth
and leisure are given him out of the common store, not
for indulgence but for service. He must cease to lay up
treasure for himself ; and, whatever his treasure may be, it
must minister no longer to selfish ends. He must renounce
his selfishness, and at least the *monopoly* of his wealth.
Culture, intellectual and sympathetic gifts, and material

riches—in so far as they are equitable possessions—are given to men as to trustees, for the benefit of God's children.*

Wealth and the Society of Friends. It is the purpose of these Papers to apply the test of familiar truths to the present condition of the Society of Friends. At this point, therefore, it is natural to ask, "What is our peculiar stewardship as a church?"

Without exceptional wealth we are also without exceptional poverty, and while consummate scholarship is infrequent among us, and our permanent contributions to literature and art are small, the grosser ignorance is perhaps still rarer. The average level of comfort, and the average breadth of mental interests, is on the whole considerable,

* There is an important distinction between the higher and lower ideals of service; between responsibility or accountability on the one hand, and ministry upon the other. One would suppose that the most richly endowed personality must be the most deeply accountable, and the most burdened with a sense of responsibility for his gifts. But in the story of Jesus we are not conscious of the debtor's attitude either towards God or Humanity; He is the generous Friend and Benefactor, the well-pleasing son of God, rather than the "profitable servant." We need, it is true, to realize what, in justice, we owe to God and to men, but the devotion of love is a nobler incentive to righteousness than the burden of debt. In the doctrine of duty we are apt to read the condemnation of our neighbour; in the law of love we rise to higher levels of service. Hence we prefer the conception of the ministry of wealth to that of its responsibility. In its high sense, ministry is the doing of our Father's business, the fulfilling of a stewardship both to man and God.

though the latter is far from remarkable. But our greatest wealth as a Society, lies undoubtedly in our spiritual inheritance of character, with its accompanying possibilities, and of a simple and direct religious teaching. If God has set the candlestick of the Society of Friends among the candlesticks of the other churches, it is not for its own glory, but that it may bear light. What light has been given us, is ours that we, too, may illuminate the surrounding gloom of the world; our wealth is so much bread, given in charge for those that hunger.

Friends suffer much from self-complacency. We would not depreciate their service in the past, nor overlook their labours in all directions to-day, but there is still a very dangerous tendency to congratulate ourselves upon a duty which we are supposed to be fulfilling or to have fulfilled, and a service which is being accomplished. We are apt to credit ourselves with a position of superiority among the churches, and to regard ourselves as the aristocracy of Dissent. But what right have we to do so?

While Friends have been more faithful in some directions than in others, their spiritual horizon must be sadly narrowed if they cannot perceive how far they have fallen short in their stewardship. With a great heritage, with exceptional advantages and opportunities, they have not fulfilled their early promise as a power for social regeneration. They have, perhaps, been justifiably shy of Socialism, but

what have they offered in its place? They have not mastered the economic problems which all reformers are discussing. They have failed to lead the social thought of the day. In spite of the magnificent opportunity offered them in their Adult Schools, they have done little to educate and evangelize the Labour Movement.

The weakness of Quakerism in its attitude towards the problem of poverty is its want of knowledge, and of any inspiring message. The most democratic and practical of the churches has not attracted the reformers and saviours of society into its fellowship. On the contrary, its apathetic caution has tended to drive out such as were found among its own members. It is a common word of disappointment among the leaders of industrial reform,—not so much that we Quakers have failed in prison-reform or licensing-reform or poor-law reform, but that we shirk the main question. This is a grave and we believe a just charge.*

(a) *Adult Schools.* The artizan represents the largest single section of our population, and is an increasing element in the membership of our Society. The Church must lay upon him also the burden of stewardship.†

* While we fear that we must make this charge against the Society as a whole, we would not overlook the notable exception of several earnest workers and brave thinkers, of the school of John Woolman, to whose efforts is largely due the growth of a nobler social ideal in a section of the Society.

† At a recent Quarterly Meeting the arrest in the growth of many of our Adult Schools was widely discussed. It was singular to notice that

For "the difficulty in England," says a recent report of the Fabian Society, "is to persuade the people to make any sensible use of the power they have." It is no easy matter to arouse the respectable working classes to a sense of their social duty; they accept their newly-gotten comfort, without realizing the responsibilities attaching to it. Even the hopeful spirit of discontent is often wanting; they have succeeded in the struggle for life, and have forgotten

there was hardly a word of allusion to the main causes of that arrest. These appear to us to be, primarily, that our meetings for worship are not the centres of inspiration which they should be, and, secondarily, that our Adult Schools do not adequately stimulate among the scholars, the spirit of social as well as individual reform. The fundamental work of our Adult Schools, is of course the directly religious and personal work, associated with the Bible Class, which has for its object the conversion of the will, and the construction of Christian character. But to quote Fairbairn: "the Churches that convert most men, *and best use the men they have converted*, realize religion in the most efficient way." We need to use our "converted men" more efficiently than we have done hitherto. In fact the Adult School movement, apart from the teaching staff, is not sufficiently aggressive. In some, at least, of our schools, the men tend to lapse into a selfish satisfaction with the benefit they themselves derive from the lessons. They are not "poor," as a rule, but mainly belong to the comfortable artizan class, and they tend to repeat in miniature the selfish apathy of the more comfortable.

Following out the idea of the stewardship of wealth, there is practical work for our Adult Schools in the collection of information, and the special investigations necessary for particular local reforms. Some of the best work being done at the present time, is that of active detailed investigation. House-to-house visiting should enable us to analyze the causes of poverty in our own parish, and these should then be dealt with in a practical way.

poverty as much as maybe. They become measurably satisfied upholders of the *status quo*. Our Adult Schools must press their responsibilities upon them. They have a far nearer knowledge of poverty than the upper or middle classes; they must be initiated into the ministry of compassion. For theirs, too, is a stewardship of comparative wealth and knowledge.*

(b) *The Social Value of Mansions.* But outside our Adult Schools much remains. Friends have done something; and may surely do more, for the breaking down of class divisions. Mr. Bushill, in his book on Profit Sharing, suggests that employers might help forward the cause of industrial peace if they would adopt a simpler mode of life. The rich man who lives unpretentiously among his employees, has certain advantages of fellowship, which the luxurious dweller in a be-butlered suburban mansion may well miss. But after all, the size of the house is not the root of the matter. "Except the Lord build the house they labour in vain who build it," but being rightly built, it is the *use* of the house that tells.

*May not the present paralysis in politics be partly due to that growth in comfort of the better paid working classes, already referred to, unaccompanied by a growth in earnestness? If the pressure of injustice be removed, and with it the incentive to struggle for reform, some other and more powerful incentive must be substituted for it. That incentive is the spirit of compassion, which the churches should foster and awaken.

It is not wealth that separates men so much as dissimilarity of ideals. In Ruskin's words, "the man who likes what you like belongs to the same class with you." And in the light of this truth, a great and beautiful house, and estate may become the unifying, instead of the separating, element in a community. It is not often that the treasures of any place are available for the general inhabitants. Even where there are Museums, Exhibitions, and Art Galleries, they would be more intelligently appreciated if their treasures were understood. It wants the man who loves, and lives among these things, to make them vivid and lovable. And this is what the man of wealth and culture can do. His house is often the most beautiful building in the district ; he has there his beloved and constant companions, his books, pictures, statuary, and he is the centre of his house. It is from his standpoint that the place and its treasures should first be viewed. He is the keeper of his gallery, and should interpret it.

Jesus sitting at a great man's dinner-table turned to His host with the words, "When you have a dinner or a supper do not invite your friends and relations and rich neighbours only, for they must invite you again, and so you will not really give anything. But when you have an entertainment ask the poor and the crippled, and you will be blest, *because they cannot recompense you.*"

You have a fine house, books, pictures, a well-walled garden. Do you ever hear the "storms that rage outside

your happy ground?" Do you remember sometimes that your house is God's, that it is part of your equipment for His service? Are you then using it as such? Or only for your own pleasure, and the entertainment of your intimate circle? Do you ever entertain the poor? And is it as a comrade or as a patron? * Perhaps they rob you of some well-earned leisure, some quiet, some comfortable isolation; perhaps their finger-marks spoil your books, their boots soil your carpets, and leave traces on your garden beds. After all, in the last analysis, the property is not exactly yours. The imperfect social system in which you prosper, is responsible for more miserable homes than there are waste papers scattered over your garden; it is accountable for more disfigured human lives, than there are thumb-marks on the pages of your books. Rejoice that whatsoever you do, for the most insignificant and least satisfactory of men, you do for Christ, and for the kindling of that spirit of God which lies dormant in each human soul. But do it generously and in love; not as a mere duty, but with a longing to share; not out of a sterile ambition to be charitable, or to teach the ignorant and improve the inferior, but out of sincere and brotherly affection.

* Many of us may feel that our work does not lie in this particular field; but even then we are none the less bound to apply to our rented house or hereditary mansion, this test: Does it hinder or increase our efficiency as servants of God and man?

The need for Practical Christianity. Theological propositions cannot take the place of the gospel, which proclaims not only the hope of a heaven beyond the grave, but the possession of a heaven now and here. We need to escape from mere doctrinal squabbles into the passionately practical life of Jesus. We need to shake off the misconception of the Millennium, as being let down from Heaven at some future time; and to realize that the Kingdom of God is already planted upon earth, transforming the minds and institutions of men. Ecclesiasticism on the one hand, and a certain section of Socialistic thought on the other, have tended to perpetuate selfishness by laying too great stress on one side of the truth, and proclaiming that the Kingdom exists only in some future age, a new regime, a new heaven and a new earth, in which alone righteousness can dwell.

If righteousness consisted in an absolute adherence to some formal doctrine, whether of ceremonial or of social order—doctrines, for instance, of the immediate communalization of property, or the equality of remuneration—the Christian life might be regarded as at present impracticable. But as such we cannot regard it. These doctrines are, after all, external. They may be realized some day, and we may rightly labour for their realization; but the teaching of Jesus went deeper than a systematizing of life. He was concerned with character. He cut at the roots of selfishness. He established neither

a hierarchy nor a socialistic state, but a kingdom of love and a society of friends.

While we cannot understand with some, that He regarded the holding of property or the acceptance of exceptional remuneration as sinful in themselves, we are certain that He condemned the whole spirit of ease, of self-seeking, and of family aggrandisement, and that selfish hugging of property which commonly disgraces the Christian. And He hated all that callous complacency which affects social reform out of a dilettante interest, while the cry of the children rings continually in the Ear of God; He hated the gross blindness which exults in "free institutions," while by its daily life it lays a bondage as heavy as slavery upon its fellow-citizens, and plunders "from the immortal mind its bright and glorious crown."

Granted that communal ownership is the ideal state for the ideal community, our lessons of private property are not yet all learnt. Have the churches nothing to teach on this matter? It is their voice, and not the voice of Christ, which wavers and lapses into impotence and silence. Every congregation, every meeting, has a disciplinary responsibility for the spiritual welfare of its richer members; and this duty cannot be neglected without injury to the moral character and influence of the church. Its neglect becomes, moreover, a cause of unbelief. An unfaithful church is the worst of Christ's enemies; it is the successor to that

unfaithful disciple who betrayed Him. A church which fails to give practical expression to its ideal may perish without regret. However true it may be to its traditions, if it bear no leaves for the healing of the nations it is a dead branch of the Tree of Life.

We Friends are rightly anxious to preserve our testimony to a simple mode of worship. Ceremonial of any kind we abhor. In our Meeting-houses we cling to the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus. But what is true of worship should be true of life. Indeed, early Friends seem to have seen clearly, that a simple worship depends for its value upon a simple life. Quite as emphatically as against ceremonial in worship, did they testify against superfluity in dress, and luxury in manner of living, as being opposed to "that simplicity which becomes the Gospel." And valuable as may be the testimony to simplicity in our meetings for worship, we believe that a testimony to simplicity in all the affairs of our daily lives, would be of greater worth to the world to-day. Unless the truths of Quaker doctrine are truths also of Quaker practice and discipline ; unless the Quaker household, factory, and business-offices, tally with the Quaker meeting, we are guilty of a fatal insincerity, which destroys with one hand what it appears to accomplish with the other.*

* It is surely unnecessary to distinguish here between true simplicity and that misapprehension which confounds it with uncouthness. No good end is served by badly cut coats or unbecoming gowns. The beautiful and the becoming, claim kinship with true simplicity.

But the evangelical spirit of life rises like sap in the branches of the Church. Among other signs we note the widespread popularity of Dr. Sheldon's books. Delivered in one of the great new cities of the Western States, as series of sermons, they have been re-published in various forms, and eagerly read by millions of men and women. To an English reader they may appear to be marred by faults of style and taste, even perhaps by errors in teaching, but the final criticism of such books as *In His Steps*, must acknowledge the supreme earnestness and simplicity of their religious doctrine. They appeal from the churches, and the scriptures of the churches,—as did George Fox—to the ever-living Christ.

O Life unlike to ours

Light half-believers of our casual creeds,
Who never deeply felt, nor clearly will'd,
Whose insight never has borne fruit in deeds,
Whose vague resolves never have been fulfill'd.

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

Those practical problems of life which perplex every thinking man and woman, are illuminated anew by the conception of the Incarnation. It is just such problems as ours, that Jesus solved in His own age ; what then would Jesus do to-day? And with the answer comes the call to follow Him.

This is the kind of teaching which will send men back to their New Testaments, not merely "hunting texts" but

seeking Christ. And evidently this is the teaching for which many are eager. Dissatisfied with all else, they will listen only to the living gospel of Jesus.

And is it not by this that our churches must stand or fall? We believe that a winnowing hour is at hand, when the spirit of Christ will blow over his threshing floor, and scatter before it all the chaff of useless doctrine, outworn hereditaments, and ceremonial symbols. And in that purging of His Church, will not Christ Himself demand of us, What have ye done for the deliverance of the poor? Even now that word of judgment is searching the congregations for His own. Great is the need for vigilance and for prayer, if Friends would rise to the standard of spiritual efficiency which the hour demands.

For it is easy to fall away, forgetting the large facts of eternity and the great duties of life, under the insidious influences of commercial success. There is special need to-day for a strenuous and unwavering testimony concerning the stewardship of wealth—whether it be thirty shillings a week or thirty thousand a year. Such a testimony must necessarily be accompanied by the repudiation of the false charity and philanthropy which are the expression of condescending pride rather than of humble service. Just in so far as the love of justice and the love of God is not manifest in His Church, will the stubborn power of unbelief prevail.

We trust that we may not be misunderstood. The discussion of practical methods is of course out of place in our meetings for worship, but the relation of these meetings to the problem of poverty is plain. If they are not to fail of their object, they must inspire the workers in the field; they must create that spiritual condition in which alone the City Beautiful can be built.

It has been proudly claimed that the Mission of the Society of Friends, is less to teach dogmas than to construct the Christian character. We stand for sincerity of word, purity of deed, and cleanness of hand. Our work is to make pure the channels of trade, until commerce becomes the expression of brotherhood, and wealth is spent and wares distributed in the spirit of Jesus when He broke bread for His disciples, and gave His life for the salvation of men.

Note.

We desire to suggest that meetings which do not already possess a collection of standard books on Social Problems should establish such a library for the use of their members. The following volumes might serve as a nucleus, those in the larger type being particularly important :—

ASHLEY, PROF. W. J.—“English Economic History,” etc. Longmans, 2 vols., 15/6.

BOOTH, CHARLES.—“Labour and Life of the People.” Macmillan; 8 vols. 3/6 each; vol. of maps, 5/-

BARNETT, S. A. & MRS.—“Practicable Socialism.” Longmans, 6/-

BOSANQUET, MRS.—“Rich and Poor.” Macmillan, 3/- net.

BUSHILL, T. W.—“Profit Sharing,” etc. Methuen, 2/6.

CARPENTER, EDWARD.—“England’s Ideal.” Sonnenschein, 2/6.

ELY, DR. R. T.—“Socialism, its Nature, Strength, and Weakness.” Sonnenschein, 6/-

FOWLE, REV. T. W.—“The Poor Law.” Macmillan, 2/6.

HERRON, PROF. G. D.—“A Plea for the Gospel,” and “The Christian Society.” H. R. Allenson, 3/6 each.

HOBSON, J. A.—“Problems of Poverty.” Methuen, 2/6.

HODDER, E.—“Life of Lord Shaftesbury.” Cassell, 3/6.

“Life of George Smith, of Coalville,” 5/-

HUGHES, REV. HUGH PRICE.—“Social Christianity.” Hodder & Stoughton, 3/6.

MARSHALL, PROF. A. — “Economics of Industry.” Macmillan, 3/6.

- MATHEWS, S. — "The Social Teaching of Jesus." Macmillan, 6/-
- MOORE EDE, REV. W.—"The Church and Town Life." Cambridge University Press, 2/-
- MORLEY, JOHN.—"Life of Cobden." Chapman, 7/6 and 1/-
- ROGERS, PROF. J. T.—"Work and Wages." Sonnenschein, 2/6.
- ROWNTREE, J., & SHERWELL, A. — "The Temperance Problem and Social Reform." Hodder & Stoughton, 6/-
- RUSKIN, JOHN.—"Unto this Last." G. Allen, 5/-
- SCHULTZE GAEVERNITZ, DR.—"Social Peace." Sonnenschein, 3/6.
- SHERWELL, A.—"Life in West London." Methuen, 2/6.
- STUBBS, C. W.—"The Land and the Labourers." Sonnenschein, 2/6.
"Christ and Democracy." Sonnenschein, 3/6.
- TALLACK, W.—"Penological and Preventive Principles." Wertheimer, 8/-
- TOYNBEE, ARNOLD.—"Industrial Revolution in England." Longmans, 10/6.
- WEBB, S. & MRS.—"Trade Unionism." Longmans, 18/-
- WESTCOTT, BISHOP.—"Social Aspects of Christianity." Macmillan, 6/-
- WYCKOFF.—"The Workers." Heinemann, 2 vols., 10/-

II.

Review.

THE TEMPERANCE PROBLEM AND SOCIAL REFORM.*

THIS book is the most important contribution which has yet been made to the solution of the most serious of social, and one of the most serious of political questions—that which the writers call the Temperance Problem. In clear, simple words, studiously moderate in tone, the nature and importance of the problem are set forth; the necessity for its solution in the interests of the nation is shown from many points of view, some of which suggest to the thoughtful mind startling, nay even appalling, reflections; the magnitude and power are displayed of a dangerous yet specially favoured trade, which is constantly widening its borders and drawing over to its side, by pecuniary considerations, numbers of the very classes who ought to be relied upon to resist its encroachments; a trade which devotes its great strength and influence both to local and imperial politics with its own financial interests as its one supreme object. All the most important aspects of this vital question are carefully set forth; and we are led to see how, in the interests of the whole of our people, in the true interests of the State, the problem is one which demands a speedy solution.

* By Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell. London, 1899. Hodder & Stoughton. Pp. 626; price 6/-

The endeavours which have been made to solve it in other lands, are explained and discussed in a thorough and judicial manner. The facts which bear upon the many attempts at prohibition are carefully collected and sifted. For the first time, he who has long sought after the truth of this matter, can feel that he is at last placed in a position to form clear and definite conclusions as to the probable working of that much-advocated policy, hitherto discussed upon the *ex parte* statements of strong and prejudiced disputants. The third chapter of the book, with its careful appeal to acknowledged authorities, its conspicuously fair use of statistics, and its avoidance of all attempt to *make* a case on either side, is certainly of special value.

The monstrous character of our licensing system, which makes enormous gifts to certain members of the community who have done nothing to deserve them, and, to a corresponding extent, penalises other members of the community (who have also done nothing to deserve it) by arbitrary reductions in the value of their properties, is admirably shown. And the joyless and gloomy nature of the lives which, not the least deserving, but the most numerous classes of the community are condemned to lead, is drawn in subdued tones but with masterly touch.

But it may truly be said that, although never in such accurate fulness, with such care and fertility of detail, in so impartial and painstaking a way, all this has been done

before. The existence of the evil is granted ; its enormity is fully proved ; much-favoured methods of grappling with it have admittedly failed ; it is an evil which is not decreasing in virulence ; the forces which make for it are growing in power ; it has become, socially and politically, a serious menace to the State itself. But does this book contribute anything towards the practical solution of the problem of how best to deal with it ? Does it hold out any sufficient and possible remedy for the evil it treats of ? Is it really constructive, and thus worthy of the careful attention of the men to whom must fall the task of defying and destroying the menace ? May our statesmen find true lines of guidance in it ? These are the questions which will arise in the mind of everyone who reads the deeply interesting pages of this most pregnant book.

Let us see the answer to them, if one is to be found.

The authors have devoted 103 pages of their book to the study of Prohibition, 35 pages to State Monopoly in Russia and South Carolina and to High License in the States of Pennsylvania and New York, and 72 pages to the Company System in Sweden and Norway. Finland is not mentioned, although the case of that interesting but unhappy country would have strongly corroborated the most important of the conclusions come to. It is upon the patient and careful consideration of the best evidence obtainable from official or private sources, and also, in the case of

Scandinavia, from personal investigation, that those conclusions are founded. They are, then, worthy of serious consideration.

What is it exactly that is suggested? In the first place, as a fundamental principle, that the trade shall be taken altogether out of private hands, and, in the second place, that it shall be worked locally, subject only to such State control as is necessary to secure honest administration, and the loyal carrying out of the conditions laid down by the law under which the changes suggested have been effected.

But the trade cannot be taken out of private hands, even if all parties were agreed, without the much-vexed question of compensation being settled by the highest legislative assembly. The conclusion to which the writers come upon this point is that "the line of least resistance will be a short time notice, possibly accompanied by a provision for money compensation if the time period should be anticipated by the action of the community."

The only objection which I should take to this statement is the use of the word "short." The length of the time limit would, no doubt, have to be fixed; but there are many ways of dealing with it so that, if extended even to seven or eight years, it should not be unduly burdensome to the community.

It must at the same time be always borne in mind that the very idea of *any* compensation for the discontinuance of a free gift is, to say the least, an extraordinary and exceptional one.

The character of the compensation may be spoken of as one of the general principles which would be laid down by the law already mentioned. Another would be the fixing of the ratio of possible licenses to the population, and here the suggestion is that there should never be more than one license to each thousand inhabitants. The third principle is that no district should have a public-house inflicted upon it against the wish of two-thirds of the inhabitants, who cared sufficiently about the matter to vote upon it.

Let us see whether these three points are reasonable. Mr. Bruce in 1891, Sir William Harcourt in 1893 and 1895, and the Bishop of Chester,* have all proposed that compensation should take the form of a time limit. Mr. Ritchie in 1888, and Mr. Goschen in 1890, proposed pecuniary compensation, but had to withdraw their proposals.

The limit of numbers mentioned, has long been recognised as one upon which most people who wish for temperance reform are agreed. "The principle of Local Veto has for many years been accepted by all of the great parties in the State, and has been embodied in two separate measures brought forward by the Government of the day."

* Since writing the above I see that Lord Peel takes the same view.

There is, then, nothing unreasonable to unbiased minds in the three preliminary points mentioned above.

But what is proposed to take the place of the multitude of private persons now carrying on the trade in their own interests? Here the Norwegian model is resorted to, but with full warning that, in applying it to this country, modifications would be required. The change would be affected by conferring "upon localities the power of granting a monopoly of the entire retail traffic within their borders, either to companies formed for that purpose, upon which the municipal councils shall be directly represented, or, under clearly defined safeguards, to the councils themselves."

It may well be wished that considerations of space had permitted the writers to carry this important branch of their solution out into more detail. It is true that the book is an organic whole and should be read as such, but I fear that some readers may not turn from the first part of Chapter VI. to the second part of Chapter V., and so may be at some loss to understand exactly how so great a change might be effected without any serious difficulties arising out of the actual nature of the case.

But let the plan proposed be adopted, and the number of public-houses be reduced even to one in each ward of a great city, or one to every 10,000 to 15,000 of the inhabitants; let the element of private profit have been eliminated, and

the only stimulus to pushing the trade be the natural wish to succeed in what is undertaken, which no system can ever overcome ; there will for many a long year, and until men grow wise, and the race out-grows dubious habits, be a large amount of profit coming into the hands of the new liquor authority. What do our friends propose should be done with these profits?

That the whole of them should be handed over to a central State authority, and that they should be granted out in fixed measure to every locality, rural and urban, whether prohibitive or not, to be applied in the furnishing of recreation to the inhabitants generally.

First, because in this way every inducement to any locality to push the trade for its own special purposes would be removed.

Second, because the trade is one which, in the interests of the community, should be diminished as much as may be. It should be made to fight itself ; gradual extinction rather than constant development being aimed at. Men and women, weary with the toil of the day, crave for society and recreation rather than for study or instruction. This is the case in all classes alike, but the middle-class has long recognised that those who are their inferiors in material comfort should have that intellectual food supplied to them in which the kind suppliers take small delight, whilst the recreative possibilities are reserved for themselves.

The old-verse says—

“Where’er the Lord erects a house of prayer,
The devil’s sure to build a temple there;
And ’twill be found, upon examination,
The latter has the larger congregation.”

The writers’ ideal is that wherever a temple to the devil remains, there should be, in its immediate vicinity, a hall of recreation in which the different requirements of weary men and women in the way of light diversion, should be carefully catered for upon strictly temperance principles.

There is nothing in all this which is quixotic, foolish, unpractical. It is no idle dream. It is, all of it, well within the possibilities of British legislative action. Those who deride or deny it must point out some more excellent way.

I have no wish in these few hurried words to exaggerate the value of the book which Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell have given to us. I scarcely think that it is possible to exaggerate that value. They have done that for which every patriot must be for ever grateful to them: they have pointed out a way of redeeming our dear country from the most damning of curses.

ROBT. SPENCE WATSON.

"And all the windows of my heart I open to the day."—
WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR
TO THE CHRISTIAN.

REVIEW :

McGIFFERT'S APOSTOLIC AGE.—

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

May, 1899.

Price 4d.

Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

**NOTE.—The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles
and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.**

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

I.

The Unlawfulness of War.

THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR TO THE CHRISTIAN.

THE position taken by the Society of Friends on the subject of war may be summed up in a single sentence. War, and the dispositions of heart that lead to war, are contrary to the spirit of Christ, and are therefore forbidden to the Christian. For the Christian the test-question must be, "What is Christ's mind on the matter?" If our Lord's character and teaching as set forth in the gospels and revealed to our hearts by His Spirit warrant us in thinking that He was ever actuated by greed or revenge or the lust of bloodshed, or ever resisted violence by violence, then we may suppose certain cases in which war might be lawful for Christians ; but if they warrant no such conclusion, it must always be unlawful. Were Christians satisfied to be simply faithful to the mind of Christ, the question would be settled here. For the whole teaching of the gospel shows that Christ came not to destroy men's lives but to save them, and that He proclaimed in word and life the brotherhood of men. "Submitting, then, our question to the Incarnation as the fundamental fact of Christianity, and to the Redemption as its sovereign purpose, and to the Spirit of Love as its beating heart, we are unequivocally

authorized to say that Christianity forbids war." The answer made by the martyr Maximilian, A.D. 295, is the only possible one for the true-hearted disciple: "I may not fight for I am a Christian." As in other parts of life, the difficulty of conforming conduct to the pattern life of our Lord remains, but the ideal itself is clear. Living by the Spirit, we must also walk by the Spirit. With respect to war, however, certain considerations have confused the simplicity of the question in many minds, and it is the main object of the present paper to examine the validity of these.

They may be enumerated as follows :

1. The allowance of war in the Old Testament.
2. Christ's acceptance of the existing institutions of His day.
3. The question whether Christ's teaching holds good in the domain of public life.
4. The related question whether His teaching is consistent with the maintenance of government at all.

I. In the first place, the sanction given to war in the Old Testament leads many to regard it as a divine institution.

"Thy most dread instrument
For working out Thy pure intent,
Is man arrayed for mutual slaughter ;
Yea, carnage is Thy daughter."

The result of this reliance upon Old Testament teaching is seen in the doctrine of war stated by Lord Bacon.

“Wars are no massacres and confusions, but they are the highest trial of right, when princes and States, that acknowledge no superior on earth, shall put themselves upon the justice of God for the deciding of their controversies by such success as it shall please Him to give to either side.” The doctrine is plainly false, for, when we consider the license of every animal passion, the ungovernable intoxication of spirit, the noise and confusion which make up a battle, it would be impossible to devise a tribunal for the decision of a moral question from which every moral influence was more rigidly excluded. We cannot suppose that when the brute passions of man are uppermost the hand of God is most directly at work. Yet the Crusaders of the middle ages and the Puritan Ironsides alike believed the doctrine, and it still lies at the root of the prayers and thanksgivings for victory offered up in our churches, and of the complacency with which we regard our bloodiest conquests as acquisitions by divine right of possessions with which God would entrust us.

Now the force of the Old Testament sanction of war is completely taken away by Christ's own treatment of Old Testament ethics and by the results of modern higher criticism, which establish the essentially progressive character of Old Testament revelation. The Sermon on the Mount may be taken as correctly representing our Lord's habitual method of treating the ethical laws of the Old Testament. He thinks of them as fragmentary

and rudimentary : it is part of His work to develop in all its fulness the righteousness latent in them. Not murder and adultery only, but also the dispositions of heart that lead to these things are condemned : the command against false swearing becomes a command to swear not at all : retaliatory justice is to yield to the higher duty of not resisting the evil-doer : the love of neighbours widens out into the duty of loving our enemies, and praying for mercy upon them. Christ ends the passage by saying "Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." It is surely clear that He did not regard Old Testament revelation as a perfect or final expression of His Father's mind. In appealing from Christ's teaching to the Old Testament we are appealing to an authority which He Himself has superseded.

In harmony with our Lord's attitude are the conclusions reached by the criticism of our own time. Revelation is found to be progressive, limited at each stage by human capacity to receive and realize it. It has been well said of the Hebrew people, "Not all at once, but by a long and painful process were the barbarian nomads developed into a nation with a message and mission to humanity Its heroes command our admiration, not because they were perfect, but because, labouring under all the limitations of their age, they were struggling, though afar, toward perfection." And

so when we find that actions repugnant to our Christian moral sense are said to be commanded by God, or are spoken of with approval by Old Testament writers, we think of them as instances of God's method of leading men through partial truth into that which is higher, or as cases where through the imperfection of the human instrument the divine leading has been misunderstood. We do not think of them as in any degree precedents for like action to-day. The allowance of war has therefore as little validity for us as the allowance of polygamy or slavery, or of the many other imperfect institutions which God overlooked in the times of ignorance. Moral progress has not been achieved by the whole field of conduct being illuminated with sudden light. "God's will," says Bishop Westcott, "is unfolded to us in many parts, little by little, in order that it may be fulfilled by the loyal labours of successive generations."

II. This consideration gives us the point of view from which to approach the next difficulty which has stood in the way of a simple following of Christ. His acceptance of the institutions of the day is felt by some to imply complete approval of them as ordained by God. Such a subject of the character and mode of expansion of the view leaves out of account His own teaching on the Kingdom of God. This is designated by Him sometimes as a thing at hand, even within the hearts of His

disciples, and sometimes as a future dispensation. It is a secret power leavening the earth, a seed of life capable, like the mustard seed, of infinite growth. But it is to co-exist on earth with the tares that mingle with it. As Drummond says, "planting His ideals in the hearts of a few poor men, Christ started them out unheralded to revolutionize the world. They did it by making friends—and by making enemies: they went about, did good, sowed seed, died, and lived again in the lives of those they helped. These in turn, a fraction of them, did the same. They met, they prayed, they talked of Christ, they loved, they went about among other men, and by act and word passed on their secret. The machinery of the Kingdom of God is purely social. It acts not by commandment but by contagion; not by fiat but by friendship."

Christ came to save the world by changing its spirit. His words touched the heart of evil rather than the specific forms in which it might manifest itself from age to age. They have thus supplied the necessary moral force for the conflict against each form of evil that has become the master-evil of the day. To take a strong instance, slavery is not directly forbidden by any distinct Christian precept, but the new spirit of brotherhood, which our Lord made the badge of discipleship, slowly uprooted it, and the downfall of the institution is rightly regarded as one of the victories of the cross. Again, living in the midst

of the Roman empire and of the profound peace ensured by its despotic rule, Christ had little to say specifically against war. It was, indeed, during the earlier centuries of Christianity, an evil which was inconsiderable beside the moral plagues which were sapping the strength of the civilized world. But His words were utterly decisive against the passions which make it possible for nations to engage in war. Poverty of spirit, mourning, meekness, the hunger and thirst after righteousness, mercy, purity of heart, peacemaking, sufferance of persecution, can any other eight qualities be proposed so opposite to the war spirit? "Our Lord's words," says Canon Benham, "were meant to be seed words, to be sown on the ground of the world and to take root after being hidden for awhile."

There is of course a deep spiritual reason for this character of the Kingdom of God. To attack the outgrowths of evil is of little lasting use except in so far as this assists you in the main business of eradicating the cancer. War, slavery, oppression die as brotherhood and justice grow. In social life brute force has given way to law, and law is enlarging into brotherhood; in international life the theory of brute force remains, and the nations swell their armaments as though their relations to one another were those of the beasts of the jungle. The theory remains, but even here its anachronism is becoming recognized. Though the visible defence of

nations is made up of forts and armies, the invisible but more potent force, which in reality keeps peace in Europe, is the moral conviction held alike by prince and peasant, that "might instead of right is hell on earth," or, as the Tsar puts it, "if the situation be prolonged, it will certainly lead to that very disaster which it is desired to avoid, and the horrors of which strike the human mind with terror in anticipation." Thanks to the leaven of Christianity, we already feel that on the battlefield humanity retraces a few thousand years of its existence and sinks down again towards the level of the brute.

III. The third difficulty, that Christian principles are inapplicable to national conduct, has a certain speciousness, because, alas! they have hitherto been mainly confined to private life. "A Christian nation is as yet unborn." But to suppose Christ's teaching binding on Christian individuals but not on Christian states is illogical, is contrary to His clear intention, and cannot be shown to be involved in the necessity of things.

It is illogical, because a nation, after all, is only an aggregate of citizens holding each other's interests in mutual trust. The trust is administered, in countries constitutionally governed, by the people themselves appointing statesmen in whom they have confidence to act as sovereign trustees. If national property were the only thing with which our statesmen were entrusted, utilitarian

considerations would possibly be sufficient for them. But when we remember that their trust extends to the mental and moral well-being of the people, to the discharge of the onerous duties of England to the subject races of which she is the nursing-mother, and to the upholding in the face of the world not merely of England's power, but far more of our national honour—our character in the world for integrity, high-mindedness, and justice—it is plain that the trust is of an infinitely larger scope, and must be governed by considerations as wide as any that ought to influence individual conduct. In all that relates to national righteousness, the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount is as binding on states as on individuals. To squander millions of the country's money upon the freeing of the West Indian slaves would have been a gross breach of duty if our rulers had been simply entrusted with the nation's property ; as it was, they were thereby nobly upholding England's claim to be called Christian.

Further, it is clear that Christ's teaching is intended to have national as well as individual application. He came to found a Kingdom of God ; His teaching, therefore, is to be not only a rule to the individual and the church, but also a rule of government to peoples and states. Luthardt says, "Christianity is the redemption even of international life. . . . [It] cast among mankind the new great thought of the Kingdom of God, and thereby set before the nations enduring peace as the aim of their history." The Old

Testament revelation exhibits the Hebrew nation as an element in the fulfilment of the divine counsel: the New Testament contains, as the parting command of Christ, the direction to "make disciples of all the nations." "We can understand," says Bishop Westcott, "that the end will be reached when the kings of the earth, according to the language of the Apocalypse, bring the glory and honour of the nations—all that they have gathered in thought and achievement—into the heavenly city. . . . If nations are, as history has proved them to be, factors in human progress, the Incarnation proclaims a brotherhood of nations no less than a brotherhood of men. It follows that every duty which is recognized in our private dealing one with another, every virtue which ennobles the intercourse of man with man, every aim which gives dignity to personal effort, every aspiration which brings enthusiasm to personal sacrifice, all the treasures of tenderness and sympathy which sweeten and illuminate common life, must find an analogous place in international relations. And, again, every vice which we indignantly condemn among ourselves—arrogance, deceit, overbearing violence, self-seeking—remains a vice, however imposing may be the scale on which it is displayed."

Lastly, the restriction of Christian morality to individual life cannot be shown to be involved in the necessity of things. Pennsylvania, during the early period of its history, presents perhaps the most illustrious example which the world has seen of a state founded and governed on Christian

principles. In the plantations of North America there was room for a Holy Experiment, which could hardly have been made in the Europe of Louis the Fourteenth. But, while it may be true that, except on a relatively small scale, "the power of love as a basis of states has never been tried," there is no reason whatever to doubt its practicability. *Nuda virtus*, the unarmed rightness of a cause, which triumphs, it may be after long patience, by its moral sovereignty alone, is the force by which God wins His victories.

The question is often asked, "How would England exist if she abandoned her war policy?" We answer that she would only disband her army because she had risen into a moral greatness in which the war spirit could not survive ; it would be because she had exchanged a career of selfishness for a career of service. A peace-loving England would have another spirit from the England of to-day. Nations throw their wealth of life into their ideals. They set themselves to achieve these, and all that is highest and purest in them replenishes the forces at their command. The energy that loves struggle for struggle's sake, redeemed from the soul-blurring business of war, would direct itself to nobler ends. The self-sacrifice, heroism, and discipline which are sterilized in camp and barrack, would inspire the new era of brotherhood. Why should these noble qualities, like blind Samsons, for ever sport their divine strength in the service of death? It is indeed most difficult to realise

the moral energy which would be possessed by a truly Christian nation. Emerson says, finely, "If you have a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that they will not declare war or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a nation of lovers, of benefactors, of true, great, and able men. Let me know more of that nation ; I shall not find them defenceless, with idle hands hanging at their sides. I shall find them men of love, honour, and truth ; men of an immense industry ; men whose influence is felt to the end of the earth ; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honour and shame ; and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion. Whenever we see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, we may be assured it will not be one that invites injury, but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the bottom of the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base ; one against which no weapon can prosper ; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race, and has the tears and the blessings of mankind."

In Manzoni's great novel, "*I Promessi Sposi*," there is a remarkable account given of the conversion of a certain unnamed lord, who, during a long life, had been the terror of the country-side. The novelist explains how it came to pass that, after his conversion, he was safe from the revenge of those whom he had given abundant cause for hating him. "The unnamed one" (*l'innominato*) "had continued his new course of life, making compensation for injuries, calling for

peace, helping the poor. The courage which he had once shown in offence and defence he now showed in doing neither the one nor the other. He always went about alone and unarmed, and remained not less inviolate than when he had been accompanied by a band of armed retainers. The memory of his old fierceness, the sight of his present gentleness, alike produced in others an admiration for him which became his principal safeguard. Here was a man, whom no one had been able to humble, become humble himself. Those who had hated him had already obtained a satisfaction greater than any *vendetta* could have procured, the satisfaction of seeing such a man penitent of his sins and sharing, so to speak, their own feelings of indignation. Many, meeting him alone and unarmed, felt no other impulse than a desire to do him honour. By virtue of his voluntary abasement his presence had acquired, without his knowing it, a new dignity and nobility. He seemed to show a still more exalted disregard of danger than of old. Men felt their hates chained before the public veneration for one who was now penitent and beneficent. To have injured him would have been regarded as a piece of baseness, almost as an act of sacrilege."

What the novelist has portrayed with such insight in the case of an individual would almost certainly take place in the case of a nation which changed its life with equal sincerity.

It is no doubt conceivable that oppression and seeming defeat might be permitted. Oppression has martyred peoples as well as individuals. But allowing due weight to this consideration, history abundantly shows that moral force is an armour worth all the navies and armies of the world.

“By the soul
Only, the nations shall be great and free.”

Moral vitality is indeed the life of national greatness. England's strength is not in her wealth or breadth of empire, but in the character of her people. The true patriotism which would accompany a renunciation of aggression and war would direct its energies to the cultivation of the “moral muscle” of the country. The enemy without would be turned into a friend by the supremacy of moral greatness; the real conflict would be with the foes within. We need patriots who will wage unceasing war with all that lowers moral vitality,—with the luxury that enervates it, the militarism that stunts it, the greed that freezes its force, the pride that fevers it,—it is here that the issues of life and death are found, and on the outcome of this struggle hangs our country's fate.

IV. The last plea in avoidance of simple faithfulness to Christ's teaching is the assertion that His teaching is inconsistent with the maintenance of government at all. Now it is true that such a sentence as “My kingdom is not of this world; if My kingdom were of this world then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to

the Jews," implies that the new order of life which Christ founded would be controlled by laws other than those of the world of His day. It is also true that, in accordance with the intellectual methods of His age and country, our Lord made free use of the startling paradoxical utterances—so fitted to arrest attention and arouse thought—in which the Jews delighted. These utterances cannot be rightly taken apart from the rest of the Master's teaching any more than we take by itself some striking phrase in a great poem or some striking line or passage of colour in a great picture. We may, no doubt, take parts of the Sermon on the Mount and extract from them conclusions apparently subversive of society, just as we may take other parts of the gospels which show an acquiescence in the existing institutions of the day and read into them an endorsement of all the principles upon which the Roman empire was based. But, if we study the gospel as a whole, we find the truth to lie between these extremes. The kingdom which Christ established was, in origin and nature, not of this world, but it was to have from the first an existence in the world side by side with the current institutions of society. These, as we have seen, it was gradually to leaven with its spirit until the kingdom of the world should be transformed into the kingdom of Christ. Christianity, in short, would not be subversive but redemptive of society, as of all other parts of life. It could not ally itself with the spirit of the world, wherever that spirit was yet unchristianized, but it would be a constant

leavening influence by continually inspiring men with its own spirit. The result is that society, as a whole, in so far as it constitutes a brotherhood of men and is controlled by the spirit of Christian love, is according to the mind of Christ, and is indeed to a large degree a product of Christianity.

We can hardly enter here into any detailed examination of the extent to which society has thus become assimilated to the type of a Christian brotherhood. In its essence it has always been a partnership and alliance between men for purposes of mutual helpfulness. It was the greatest achievement of the middle ages, little by little to build up throughout Europe this great stronghold of freedom and buttress against brute force. Its spirit is indeed only in part Christian; the rule of custom and law is not always identical with that of love; but, however imperfectly, it consecrates the principles of brotherhood and justice and makes for the fuller realization of the purposes of God.

We therefore accept society with its appanages of government and law as a good which is to be transmuted by Christian effort into a still higher good. This position involves acceptance *pro tanto* of the forces by which society maintains the supremacy of government and law. While these forces are mainly moral, as for example the respect for law ingrained in most Englishmen, physical force is

numbered among them. Has it a right place among these forces, and if so what are its limits? In other words, does the Christian spirit which condemns war condemn also the use of the police? A somewhat knotty question to encounter at the end of our paper.

Now, while physical force is not the best of remedies, it is not an evil in itself, being indeed the foundation of much honest toil, innocent exercise and heroic effort, and may therefore be rightly used by society in restraint of wrong-doing and for the reformation of the wrong-doer, provided always that it is employed in absolute subordination to the spirit of justice and brotherhood which should animate society. Thus subjected to the higher moral forces of the state, its position is opposite to that which it takes on the battlefield. Here it is the servant of law, there it supersedes all law. Here it is employed for purposes of justice, there it is the wild weapon of human passion. Here it preserves, there it destroys.

If there were a federation of the peoples of Europe, there can be little doubt that an analogous right to use physical force in subordination to the supreme law of the federation would arise. William Penn, in his scheme for a high court of nations, made provision for this.

The Roman legions and the British army in India have, in this point of view, some justification for their existence, though not for their methods of action, in so

far as their function has been the maintenance of the *Pax Romana* and the *Pax Britannica*, with their attendant blessings.

We expressly guard ourselves from giving approval to the use of the *methods* of war, even in the service of law and righteous government. We admit that physical force has its place among the higher forces at command, but we believe that it is now used to an altogether disproportionate extent by society, and in part from wrong motives. The true object of criminal law is not revenge, but prevention and reformation. And with respect to the preservation of peace among the subject races of the empire—a task which we cannot shirk—the strong hand has again and again been too much in evidence, and we have trusted too little to justice, “the miracle worker among men.” The success of William Penn’s Indian policy, and that of the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Dominion of Canada, stand in marked contrast with much else in our colonial history. Upright and generous government, sympathetic knowledge of the native races, and a careful protection of them against their own weakness of moral stamina, and against the greed of unprincipled traders and settlers, these are the best preservatives of peace. While steadfastly upholding the mass of good that exists in our institutions of government at home and in our wider empire over sea, it is our part to help to bring them, both in principles and methods, into fuller harmony with the Christian spirit.

We have up to this point been endeavouring to show that the principle of the unlawfulness of war to Christian men and nations, which is plainly deduced from Christ's own example and teaching, is not impaired by any of the current arguments. It remains for us to see how far the principle extends, and what is the individual duty it imposes on us.

Its scope is clearly limited to Christian men and states. We do not assert that unchristianized men or nations are to live up to a measure of enlightenment which they do not possess. Robert Barclay states this most important limitation of the doctrine in the following words: "As to what relates to the present magistrates of the Christian world, we may boldly affirm that they are far from the perfection of the Christian religion. And, therefore, while they are in that condition, we shall not say that war, undertaken upon a just occasion, is altogether unlawful to them. For even as circumcision and the other ceremonies were, for a season, permitted to the Jews, not because they were either necessary of themselves, or lawful at that time, after the resurrection of Christ, but because that spirit was not yet raised up in them whereby they could be delivered from such rudiments; so the present confessors of the Christian name, who are yet in the mixture, and not in the patient suffering spirit, are

not yet fitted for this form of Christianity, and therefore cannot be undefending themselves, until they attain that perfection. But for such, whom Christ has brought hither, it is not lawful to defend themselves by arms, but they ought, over all, to trust to the Lord."

A right understanding of this limitation is very necessary. When William Penn asked George Fox what he should do about wearing a sword, George Fox replied "Wear it as long as thou canst." The question was to be settled, not as a matter of conformity to the practices of Friends, but as a matter of obedience to the light of truth within. It was only where the life and power that took away the occasion of all wars were experienced that there could be a non-reliance on the arm of flesh.

We cannot therefore advocate peace as a mere measure of policy to be adopted by states only nominally Christian : or we should be crying Peace, peace, where there is no peace. The nation that would disband its armies must also renounce the greed and jealousy and aggression that foment war. We uphold not the passive peace which accompanies national degeneracy and results in the triumph of injustice, the abandonment of just rights or weak compliance with the demands of fear, but that living peace which grows with and is part of the activity of righteousness.

It is no part of our duty to attempt to re-model the relations of states upon the present footing of jealousy and mistrust. A false formula does not produce correct

results. But are we therefore to stand palsied before the vast military fabric which is oppressing Europe? Emerson says, "Thus always are we daunted by the appearances, not seeing that their whole value lies at bottom in the state of mind. It is really a thought that built this portentous war establishment, and a thought shall also melt it away. The standing army, the arsenal, the camp, and the gibbet do not appertain to man. They only serve as an index to show where man is now ; what a bad, ungoverned temper he has ; what an ugly neighbour he is ; how his affections halt ; how low his hope lies. He who loves the bristle of bayonets only sees in their glitter what beforehand he feels in his heart. It is avaricè and hatred ; it is that quivering lip, that cold, hating eye which built magazines and powder-houses."

While then we are absolutely right in advocating every advance, whether in the direction of a reduction of armaments, fuller resource to methods of mediation and arbitration, or otherwise, which may be justified by the growing enlightenment of conscience in our own nation or in the world at large, our radical task is to change men's ideas. The institutions which govern the world depend for their vitality upon the current of men's thoughts. Divert the current and the channel becomes dry. If the statutes for burning heretics were still in force, they would not avail to light again the fires of Smithfield. War depends for its existence upon certain principles which the world has not

yet outgrown. It has no broader foundation than the foundation which they afford. They have had dominion, it is true, for long centuries ; the world is not awakened to see that their day is over ; men still nestle in these abominations of the past, but the law of love is displacing the old law of hate, and the bayonet and cannon will yet take their place in the museum with the implements of other forms of savage life. The fact is that, although we cannot work for peace with the passions that breed war, there are already in the world side by side with these the higher influences which make for peace ; and we can cultivate these forces which are now so strong that a slight further elevation of national feeling would avail to lift the world from the stage of war into that of arbitration. Mankind has moved far already : a little further enlightenment would suffice to abolish war. Let us aid the cause all we can, by personal faithfulness to our convictions, by striving to awaken the conscience of the Christian church to like faithfulness, and, in the sphere of politics and civic life, by promoting a patriotism based on righteousness and advocating the Christian policy of peace that would go hand in hand with this higher patriotism. The great need is to spread the light, to familiarize men with the new ideal : to call them out of their shell of selfishness and indifference into the larger life in which they can themselves help forward the cause of human brotherhood.

II.

Review.

McGIFFERT'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

I HAVE been asked to write for the Present Day Papers a brief review of a recent work by a New York Professor, which deals with the genesis and development of Christianity in the earliest period of its existence, and I have accepted the invitation with a ready mind, partly because it is a book of some importance to Friends as indicating that modern methods of study are leading us to some of the same views which were enunciated by the fathers of the Society two hundred and fifty years since, and partly because it is a book that has been handled with undue roughness and contempt by the reviewers, at least in religious and denominational magazines, or, when favourably noticed, has hardly passed beyond faint praise, whereas it should have been received with a much higher measure of approbation, if we are not prepared to defy critical methods altogether, and to sacrifice all its results upon the altar of our preconceptions.

However vulnerable the book may be (and a volume of nearly 700 pages, teeming with new ideas and redolent of new modes of study, is sure to be that) it is certainly

one of the most remarkable works, amongst the many that deal with the genesis of Christianity, that have been produced in the present age : nor is there in the English language any work that carries one so completely to the vantage-ground which the modern critic (and especially the German modern critic) has, in interpreting the records of the Christian religion ; for Professor McGiffert is a disciple of the newest school of thought, and is a pupil of the great German Church Historian, Professor Harnack, and he establishes for us the paradox that, in things critical, New York is nearer to Berlin, than is either London, or Oxford, or Cambridge. Perhaps this is one reason why his work has been disliked in so many quarters, for I see in some of the press notices of the book contemptuous references to the closeness with which McGiffert follows his German teachers, as if it were almost as dangerous to English susceptibilities that theology or history should be made in Germany, as that we should import our hardware from thence.

Here then is a book in which (i.) the Life of Christ is interpreted from the standpoint of the doctrine of the Kenosis,—a word used to describe the self-limitation of Jesus Christ, based upon St. Paul's statement that he made himself of no reputation (*Phil.* ii., 7)—(ii.) the documents of the Christian religion are treated from the standpoint of the Higher Criticism ; and (iii.) the History of the Church, from a point of view which is almost entirely

that of the Evolutionist; and in which (iv.) the life of the Christian believer is explained in terms of direct spiritual illumination, (v.) the sacraments are read in the light of the latest textual and historical criticism, and (vi.) the worship of the early Church is reconstructed with a freedom from ecclesiastical prejudice, which is sufficiently evident when we state that neither Presbyterianism nor Lutheranism, neither the Church of McGiffert, nor the Church of Harnack, preserves any trace of some of the peculiarities which are declared to have been characteristic of the ancient mother Church.

Now with regard to these points, a few detailed criticisms will not be out of place. And first of all with regard to the doctrine of the Kenosis. This term, which is rapidly becoming a part of the vocabulary of the modern theologian, is, in reality, nothing more than a substitute for the term Incarnation, which has been rendered necessary by the timid and faltering and unreal manner in which the idea that our Lord became man has been received in the Church. Like the word Incarnation, it implies a pre-existence; for to say that He limited Himself involves some kind of previous non-limitation, and this self-limitation, while on the one hand it is affirmed to have united Him with men, yet differentiates Him from men, seeing that we have as yet obtained no evidence whatever that a similar, voluntary self-limitation has occurred in our own past history, or in that of any other

person. And it is important to make these preliminary explanations of the term Kenosis, because it is sometimes regarded as if the word were merely a thin disguise for Unitarianism. That this is not the case may be seen by a convenient instance. Most persons who approach the question of the Kenosis of Jesus Christ do so from a desire to better understand those scriptures which limit, or seem to limit, His omniscience, and which, therefore, suggest that in the Incarnation this limitation of universal knowledge was involved. The starting-point for them is usually such a text as that in which the Lord declares that no one knows the day nor the hour [of the final consummation]; "no *not the Son*, but the Father." And it is reasonably inferred that if the knowledge of the Son is limited with regard to the knowledge of the Father, then Kenosis is involved in the statement. But it should be remarked that if we are to deduce our theology from single texts (and in that case this is as good a one as we can begin with, seeing that it contains a statement which must be a part of the primitive deposit of the Gospels, for who would invent a statement in later times, which puts the words "I know not" into the mouth of Jesus Christ) then the very same text must be held to be also in evidence for the differentiation of Christ's knowledge from the knowledge of common humanity, for how else would there be any force in the contrast "no, not the Son"; the word Son requires a capital letter

in order to make the sentence intelligible, or which is the same thing, the passage which is supposed to involve Kenosis does not involve Unitarianism. And the same thing is true of all similar statements in the Scriptures which teach that our Lord grew in grace, or learned obedience, or suffered weakness. They are all capable of being interpreted Kenotically, and the assumption that our Lord became voluntarily recipient of gracious influences, or voluntarily a learner in human schools, or voluntarily under the limitations of human weakness, does not in the least militate against what are commonly called orthodox views of the Person of Jesus Christ, the value of which views is precisely the equivalent of the Doctrine of the Incarnation; they can only be held and interpreted as the Incarnation is held and interpreted.

So much for Kenosis generally; and at the same time it should be remarked that the change which has taken place in terms has, along with the advantage which has accrued, brought with it a certain element of danger. It is, doubtless, an untold gain to read our Lord's life naturally, and to get rid of the fantastic doubleness and unreality of the older methods of reading His words, or explaining His actions. We are not any longer obliged to say with the French lady, of whom our friend, Anne Richardson, wrote recently in *The Spectator*, that "my friend, the Abbé, has assured me that our Lord was *not* a Jew," nor is it required that we say the words "He was a Jew" with bated breath,

which is only another way of saying that "He was not a Jew." We can hold the Pauline statement that He was under the law, and not require too subtle a distinction between the fact that Christ was made under law, and the similar statement that Paul was so made, if, indeed, any distinction at all is necessary. All of this is clear gain ; it makes exegesis honest, and it makes Christ real, and it sends the Docetist about his business. But then there is a certain risk which comes in along with the gain : it is a risk which is very nearly the same as that of the person who has accepted the doctrine of Evolution, and who insists on the fact that he has found, not only a new hypothesis by which to explain natural phenomena and to interpret natural history, but that he has found the final hypothesis to which there is no supplement needed, and that he has disentangled the truth of which all other truths are mere broken arcs. Happily we are finding out that Evolution and Materialism are not convertible terms ; we can be loyal to the former and be hostile to the latter, without falling into any contradiction by the way. And it is the same with the study of the Kenosis of Jesus Christ. It explains so much, one is almost tempted to say it explains everything. We feel that we must be loyal to it, and our very loyalty may drag down the life that we are endeavouring to interpret, just as our loyalty to Evolution may vulgarize, or sterilize, or pauperize our conception of the Universe at the very point where the new doctrine was most elevating and enriching that conception.

I make these preliminary remarks because it seems to me that McGiffert has occasionally come near to a misunderstanding of Christ's life, through the very skill and freedom of his Kenotic explanations of that life. He assumes that the Christ grew, advanced, became more enlightened, but he will hardly allow that He outgrew or that He advanced beyond the men of His time, nor does he make enough of the admitted and recognised fact that our Lord was supernaturally enlightened as well as Kenotically limited. Now it is clear that if Christ is to remain the object of our wonder, or the mark of our devotion, He must have moved faster than other men into unknown truth, and have left the things that are behind in a more rapidly receding horizon of the past than the average good man is able to do. McGiffert's Christ moves too slowly for the world's wonder to attach to him. It is carefully impressed upon us that He never outgrew the religion in which He was brought up ; that He never contemplated, for instance, the abolition of the Jewish law. "It never seems to have occurred to Him that the time would yet come for its abrogation." "He certainly observed it faithfully Himself, and He spoke and acted in such a way that His disciples did not think of any other course as legitimate or possible." ". . . Jesus thus maintained a conservative attitude towards the law."

Now there is a grain of truth in this, but not the whole truth.

In the first place the statement involves a partial view of history. It does not do justice to the independence which our Lord showed towards the law and towards the ritual in which He was brought up. Where is the evidence that He ever took part in a Jewish sacrifice, or that He ever shed any blood except His own? But suppose that such evidence were forthcoming, the student would have to allow that He emancipated Himself to a large extent from the religion in which He had been educated, or how can he explain that the earliest Judæo-Christian sects, which have certainly followed His teaching in many respects, were so keen at emphasising the rejection of animal sacrifices as a part of Christ's teaching? They even went so far as to put into His mouth the statement : "I am come to put an end to sacrifices, and unless ye cease from sacrificing, my wrath shall not cease to rest upon you." Will it be said that they merely annexed to His teaching certain elements from the system of the Essenes? In that case there were in the world men who were more enlightened than Jesus Christ; and then what becomes of our adoration or our worship, if He did not even accept great truths which the world already stood on the borders of? We do not worship—even with the explanation of His movements furnished by the Kenosis—a Christ, who moves so slowly as that.

Put it another way: some thirty years or, perhaps, twice thirty, after the first promulgation of the Law-restricted

Gospel, which McGiffert believes Christ never to have emancipated Himself from, a Christian writer described the whole system of Judaism as waxing old, and on the verge of vanishing. His insight was correct, as history has proved. He had certainly made progress religiously in leaving behind the things that he saw to be passing into the background. He is a sufficient demonstration of the fact that within the space of a number of years, less than twice Christ's life on earth, the emancipation of the souls of men from the legal system and its concomitant ritual was an accepted fact. Yet Christ in his thirty years never reached it, if we may trust McGiffert. Then his outlook was very limited, and the Kenosis is responsible for something worse than Unitarianism, viz. : for a permanently narrow angle of vision, which marks Him as less than an ideal man, if not inferior to many actual men of His time.

The same thing is true with regard to His personal illumination ; like ourselves, He was in the world to be enlightened ; we Kenotics hold that ; for Him there was a descending dove and a Bath Kol (or voice from Heaven) that instructed and approved His way : for us there is something of the same kind. But where did this illumination lead Him ? Did it instruct Him with regard to His own relationship to the Father ? According to McGiffert, "Jesus' emphasis of faith in or of acceptance of himself, is throughout an emphasis not of His personality but of His message, and thus simply a reassertion of

filial trust in, devotion to and service of God, as the essential and sufficient condition of an eternal life of blessedness with God in Heaven." Suppose, for a moment, that this statement is at once true and historically adequate. It is clear that the Christian Church, as a whole, rapidly passed beyond it. That they laid stress on his personality is proved, *inter alia*, by the fact that Dr. McGiffert, as a Christian believer, lays stress on it also. Before the Gospel Canon was finished (whatever date that may involve) they represented Christ as asking a man whether he "believed in the Son of God," the man in question having heard not a single word of His message, nor received from Him a single admonition with regard to "filial trust in God or devotion to His service." And whoever wrote the incident, thinks it a sufficient evangel to tell the person that is being questioned that "Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee." Thus the Christian Church advanced rapidly with regard to the doctrine of Christ's person (apart from all question as to whether the incident alluded to above is historical or not). Yet we are asked to believe that He himself never advanced beyond His own Messiahship. In that case either the Church moved much too fast, or He himself much too slow. They evolved doctrines which He either never knew or never taught them, and, the doctrines being assumed to be true, for Dr. McGiffert does not question them, the Kenosis prevented Him from knowing what they found out,

without a Kenosis at all, by the simple road of direct spiritual illumination. Now, if their spiritual illumination was sufficient for the discovery of these momentous truths concerning Christ's personality (and certainly it would be proper to say to the man who first made the discovery, "Blessed art thou—Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee") why should it be regarded that Christ's own illumination was insufficient to attain to a knowledge of Himself, which Peter attained to, or which at all events was attained to not so very long after Peter's day, and was regarded by many as the rock upon which Peter built, if he was not actually builded himself upon it.

To sum up the argument: it was believed, certainly from very early times, that Christ revealed His Person to men as well as taught them His truth. Amongst the things revealed to the babes of the Kingdom this is either primitively reckoned, or early incorporated. We can scarcely imagine a benediction of any kind pronounced upon those who become recipients of such a revelation, if He who pronounced the benediction were ignorant of what He blessed them for. "Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent" may apply to us, it can hardly be appropriate to Him.

For these reasons I think some caution is necessary in following the striking and often convincing analysis which McGiffert makes of the way in which Christ's mission

was unfolded to Himself, and the way in which the doctrines of the new Teacher were appropriated and expanded by the first disciples of the Kingdom.

We have discussed this point at some length, and must therefore be more brief with what remains. This is a matter for some regret, inasmuch as we would rather praise than blame, or appear to blame, and the rest of the book deserves little else but praise. It is fearless, acute, and often very convincing in its discussion of the genesis of the early Christian Church.

Perhaps the most important historical correction which McGiffert makes to the traditional interpretation of the New Testament, consists in his frank acceptance of what is now known as the South Galatian theory of St. Paul's early travel and ministry; according to which the Galatians addressed by Paul in his epistle and alluded to by the writer of the Acts of the Apostles are no longer to be regarded as an isolated company of invading Celts who have been stranded in the middle of Asia Minor, but as the dwellers in the Roman province of Galatia whose centres of population are precisely the Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium, which are the scenes of the first preaching of St. Paul. It is a great gain to have substituted these cities for the unknown and unlikely Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium, which figure in the pages of those writers who have insisted on taking Paul into countries off the line of civilisation and

amongst peoples with whose language he must have been totally unacquainted (for we know from St. Jerome that down to his day they still spoke Gallic in the middle of Asia Minor). And it need hardly be said that this correction, which Prof. Ramsay has done so much to elucidate and to verify, is the real key both to the understanding of the Epistle to the Galatians and of the Acts of the Apostles. It furnishes us with explanations of many difficult expressions, illustrates the countermining to which the Apostle's work was subject at the hands of the false Apostles who followed on his track, and in all probability reconstructs for us the chronology of the extant Pauline Epistles, by putting back the Epistle to the Galatians into the place at the head of the list which it undoubtedly occupied in some of the earliest Churches and canonical lists. But this is a subject to which so much attention has been drawn of late, that we need hardly do more than give a welcome to McGiffert as a reinforcement to the ranks of the South Galatians.

Probably the directions in which the book will be most interesting to Friends are three:—its conception of the individual spiritual life, its view of the sacraments, and its sketch of worship in a primitive Christian religious meeting. We can do little more than quote some of Dr. Giffert's striking sentences. He treats of the spiritual life as being a direct knowledge of God through Christ raised from the dead; it is a form of direct personal illumination. Not

only is this true (as indeed everyone concedes) in the case of the Apostle Paul, but it is affirmed to be the experience also of James, the Lord's brother. "He was converted by a vision of the risen Jesus, as Paul was"; "James was not a disciple at the time of those earlier manifestations, but became such as a result of his own vision of the risen Lord." "It is necessary to assume, in the light of subsequent events, that James' conversion was complete and thorough going, and led him to throw himself heart and soul into the service of the Master."

It is a little surprising, at first, to meet with such a suggestion, but perhaps this is because we have never really faced the question whether James, the Lord's brother, needed to be converted to faith in Him, nor have we sufficiently tried to realize the parallelism which may underlie the Pauline expressions: "He appeared unto James . . . He appeared unto me also." Each vision must have had a distinct spiritual effect upon the one that saw it. If, however, a vision of the risen Christ, or faith that is equivalent to vision (for blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed) be conceded as a determining fact in the spiritual lives of the great Apostles, it follows of necessity that they must have incorporated their experience in the Gospel which they preached; for from experience they certainly preached, as those who had touched, handled or wonderingly looked upon the Word of Life. Thus

McGiffert's suggestion falls in with the mystical interpretation of the Gospel, according to which one not only hears another tell of Christ but also himself apprehends Christ raised from the dead, and becomes united with his vision. This is beautifully brought out by the writer in the following passage, which will make all the mystics give him the right hand of fellowship.

“The accuracy of Paul's declaration that he had determined not to know anything among the Corinthians save Jesus Christ and Him crucified, is confirmed by both of his epistles to them. All that he has to say in those epistles about the duties of the Christian life is brought into relation with that fundamental truth. When he warns them against licentiousness and intemperance, he reminds them that they have been joined to the Lord, and that their bodies are members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit. When he discusses the subjects of marriage, of meats offered to idols, of the Eucharist, of spiritual gifts, and of the resurrection, he makes the oneness between the believer and Christ the controlling principle in every case. When he condemns idolatry, he does it not on the ground that it detracts from the glory of the one supreme God, but that it makes union with Christ impossible Though there was much in the lives of those to whom he wrote that he had to complain of, he could yet call them to witness that Christ had been proved, in their own experience,

the power of God, and that he had been made unto them wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption."

Special attention should be given in the next place to McGiffert's remarks on the Eucharist or Lord's supper. It is a subject upon which textual criticism has been speaking very forcibly of late; and, as our Friends probably know, the so-called "words of institution" which make so large a part of the accepted obligation of Christian people to celebrate some kind of eating and drinking, are in process of disappearance from the text, if they have not altogether disappeared. They disappear from the text because there is good reason to believe they never belonged there.

McGiffert is a little perplexed by the textual and historical phenomena with which he has to deal. He feels obliged to allow that the common consent of Christendom "makes it almost necessary to assume that the custom [of the Eucharist] was already observed in the very earliest period." But on the other hand, "that the disciples held a special service and partook of a special Communion meal, there is no sign." And he solves the perplexity by the natural assumption that "whenever they ate together they ate the Lord's supper. Not that it preceded or followed the ordinary meal, but that the whole meal was the Lord's supper." It should be observed that

if this is correct, no words of institution are necessary, or rather the words of institution become the exact equivalent of Grace before meat and Grace after meat, or as Aristides puts it in treating of the early Christian customs, "over their food and their drink they give thanks!" In which connexion it should be observed that McGiffert's statement that the Lord's supper neither preceded nor followed the ordinary meal, should be supplemented by the remark that when it began to be differentiated from the ordinary meal, it appears to have followed that meal, for the Teaching of the Apostles directs "*after ye have been filled*, give thanks as follows," which is not exactly a support to the doctrine of Fasting Communion, and appears to be remote by some leagues from either Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation.

McGiffert's foot-note, in which he discusses the suggestion of Prof. Percy Gardner that perhaps the Eucharist owed its evolution to St. Paul, should be carefully read, especially in view of the points which it concedes. "The fact must be recognised that it is not absolutely certain that Jesus himself actually instituted such a supper and directed his disciples to eat and drink in remembrance of him. . . . It is a notable fact that neither Matthew nor Mark records such a command, while the passage in which it occurs in Luke is omitted by many of the oldest MSS. and is regarded as an interpolation by Westcott and Hort. Even if the words belong in the

Gospel of Luke (as some maintain) they are evidently dependent upon Paul, and supply no independent testimony as to the original utterance of Christ. . . . There can be little doubt that Matthew and Mark, so far as they agree, represent the primitive tradition of Christ's words." . . .

"To read into this simple and touching act—unpremeditated and yet summing up in itself the whole story of his life of service and of sacrifice—subtle and abstruse doctrines, is to do Jesus a great injustice."

We have only a brief space for a reference to McGiffert's reconstruction of the early Christian worship, and the gifts of the early believers considered as ministers of the word. The following very fine summary of what we learn concerning Christian worship from the directions for its regulation in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, might very well be printed, along with a similar passage in Neander's Church History, as a Friends' Tract for the Times (that is, if we ever do propose to publish rational tracts instead of our present impossible collection).

"Whoever had a psalm, or a teaching, or a revelation, or a tongue, or an interpretation, received it from the Spirit, and when he communicated it to his brethren, it was accepted as a divine and not as a mere human utterance. It is in the light of this fact that the freedom which characterized the Corinthian services must be interpreted.

That freedom seems at first sight to have been complete. The confinement of the right to participate, to a certain class or certain regularly appointed individuals, was evidently quite unknown. Every Christian had the right to take such part as he wished, and the woman's right was equal to the man's. *But the recognition of that right was not due to the Corinthians' recognition of the equality of all believers ; it was due to their reverence for the Spirit of God. A disciple had the right to take part in the services not because he was a Christian possessed of equal privileges with all his brethren, but simply because he was an organ of the Spirit, and it was the Spirit's will that he should speak. Unless the Spirit prompted him, he had no right whatever. And hence the freedom which is so characteristic a mark of the services as they appear in Paul's epistle was, after all, decidedly limited. There was freedom for the Spirit, not for men as men."*

The italics are ours : I do not know whether the distinction between the theocracy and the democracy of the early Church has ever been better expressed. And we need only add that if this doctrine of reverence for the Spirit of God be the real explanation of the early Christian worship, it is difficult to see how their method of worship can ever become out of date or obsolete, except in so far as reverence for the Spirit of God has gone out of fashion or been deemed to be exaggerated or improper.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

“And all the windows of my heart I open to the day.”—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. Vol. II.

WORK FOR PEACE.

REVIEW :

ILLINGWORTH'S PERSONALITY.—

JOAN M. FRY.

June, 1899.

Price 4d.

Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

**NOTE.—The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles
and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.**

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

I.
Work for Peace.

WORK FOR PEACE.

PROBABLY the reason why so few people do peace work is that so few take the trouble to study the question. There is a great difference between holding peace principles in the vagueness of tradition and grasping them with the intelligent conviction that comes from personal examination. Surely those who feel a sense of the awful horror of war, its ghastly cruelty, its pandering to every savage lust of humanity, its sheer futility, its oppressive burden, should also feel it a duty to read the subject up so that they may have an answer to give for the faith that is in them.

It has been said that every man has material in his own experience for the writing of one good novel, and we are convinced that any man could provide himself, without any undue tax on his time, with materials for one good peace address.

Study of the question is also a most potent means of advancing peace. Sir Arthur Helps has said, "The first of all things in a great cause is to reason it out well.

When it is securely reasoned it is gained. There remains much to be done by the head and by the hand, with the tongue and with the pen, and there may be many partial issues of success and defeat, but superior intelligences, if such regard mortal affairs, would know that the work was, spiritually speaking, done." The truth of this receives apt illustration at the present time. The question of permanent arbitral tribunals could not have taken practical shape at the Peace Conference, if it had not been for the preparatory work that has been given to it, over a long period of years, by the leading Peace societies. Again, the exposure of war from the economic standpoint recently made by M. Bloch, a retired Russian banker, in his cyclopædic work on "The Future of War," is known to have made a profound impression on public opinion.

There are many branches of the subject which well repay study. Our Lord's teaching on the character and methods of expansion of the Kingdom of God is fundamental, if we would understand the divine purpose of righteousness and peace for the world. We have referred to this in our last paper,* where, however, the sentence † should read, "Such a view leaves out of account His own teaching on the subject of the character and mode of expansion of the Kingdom of God." This kingdom, instituted by Christ in His own life of ready obedience to the will of God, was to be propagated

* Pp. 9-12.

† At the foot of p. 9.

through the world in the lives of His disciples. On a small scale it was realized in the local "ecclesiæ" of Christians, on a larger scale in the Church universal that includes all true disciples: it is in process of slow realization on the largest scale as national and international life become christianized. Wherever it spreads, the principles which marked its foundation accompany it: loving subjection to God as Father, and loving service to men as our brothers.

Another most important line of study is the investigation of the gradual triumph of law over brute force. The phrase is an epitome of history. "After all," as Lord Salisbury has said, "the great triumph of civilization in the past has been in the substitution of judicial determination for the cold, cruel, crude arbitrament of war." Our present conception of human brotherhood has grown out of successive extensions given to the idea of actual blood-relationship. We can trace the way in which, in regular stages of progress, the family or the tribe, and, in a higher stage, the village community or the city community, became the domain within whose limits the sanctions of patriarchal authority, or of custom, or of rude legal tribunals ensured a measure of peace; while, beyond their pale, every stranger was an enemy and at the mercy of the strong hand. Again, as we trace the gradual development of national life out of these more primitive forms, we find reproduced the mixed reign of law and brute force which now obtains in

international life. In the feudal ages of France and Germany, for instance, private war constantly over-rode the proceedings of the Courts of Justice; and the Truce of God, by which the clergy sought to control this license at certain seasons and on certain days of the week, ranks amongst the greatest instances of the power of the Church. In England the King's Courts asserted their authority very gradually; the great barons were almost a law to themselves, and exercised countless petty jurisdictions which formed the real legal system under which the mass of the population lived. William the Conqueror enacted or re-enacted a law which declared that murder done on any of the four great Roman roads that ran through England was a breach of the King's peace. So limited was the authority of the central government. Law in its growth assimilated many of the old warlike methods, and history abounds with examples of the way in which these were rubbed down and changed into legal processes. At Rome, for instance, the oldest legal proceeding was based on a mock combat, with a pretended voluntary reference to arbitration, and the wager of a sum of money that was to go to the arbitrator for his trouble. We find the same kind of thing under the form of an actual fight in the wager of battle of English law, which lingered on into the present century. The substitution of money fines for blood feuds, the suppression of duelling, the gradual formation of rules of international law protecting the peace of neutrals during time of war, and

the adoption of methods of arbitration for the settlement of international differences, are other illustrations of the continuous steady advance of the reign of law. If the Conference at the Hague succeeds in establishing a permanent arbitral tribunal in Europe, another great step will have been made. Law, as applied to international questions, will have emerged from the stage of experiment into that of an organised and readily applicable institution.

A third line of inquiry takes note of the growth of humane feeling, mainly as a result of the slow christianizing of society. The suppression of gladiatorial games, the condemnation of infanticide, the abolition of torture, the growth of charitable institutions, the rooting-out of slavery, the amelioration in the conduct of war introduced by international law, all deserve study in this connection. It is clear that civilization, both in its love of law and its dislike of cruelty, tends to become more and more hostile to war.

Again, the essential solidarity of the interests of mankind is a topic that demands full place in our presentation of peace. Mr. Balfour has recently asserted this truth in explicit language. "Mr. Courtney," he said, "has repudiated in accents of passionate feeling the narrow, most foolish and most selfish view which has unfortunately too often actuated the policy of nations—the view, I mean, that anything which injures those whom they are pleased to term their rivals is

necessarily of benefit to themselves. The whole history of the world shows the folly of that principle. Anything which conduces to the prosperity of another country does, indirectly, but most truly and really, conduce to our own interests. And to suppose that the world is divided up into a set of self-contained communities, who may indeed profit by the loss of others, but cannot gain by their gain, is the most grotesque and most unhappy superstition which has ever misguided the councils of great nations."

To gain a conviction, by a study of the question along these various lines, that war is opposed alike to the purposes of God, to the highest instincts of civilized man, and to the material interests of the world, is to gain a wide platform from which to advocate peace. War stands exposed as an institution without divine sanction, drawing its strength from the brute passions which still haunt mankind, and from the lower self-regarding motives of greed and selfishness, which are antagonistic to the best welfare of humanity.

Having then this personal conviction, how are we to make use of it for influencing others? Our first and most general duty is individual faithfulness. Joseph Sturge says, most truly, "It seems to be the will of Him who is infinite in wisdom, that light upon great subjects should first arise, and be gradually spread, through the faithfulness of individuals in acting up to their own convictions. I suppose

it was the faithfulness of John Woolman, in reference not only to holding slaves, but to the disuse of slave-grown produce, that did more than anything else towards clearing the Society of Friends both of slave-holding and slave-dealing, though he appears to have stood comparatively alone for many years." To uphold truth by acting it out is the surest way of spreading its influence. This was the secret of the power of the early church. The blood of martyrs proved a fruitful seed. In like manner the forefathers of our own Society were men whose lives faithfully reflected the light that came to them; they bore witness to truth, suffered for it, died for it, if necessary, and thus carried it to victory. We covet a like faithful witness from Friends to-day. Does not our testimony, upon such a subject as war, lack power because we are content too often to repeat the phrases of a former time, and too idle or too cowardly to give them present day point and force? It is a fundamental duty of the Christian to "stand aloof from unrighteousness."

Personal faithfulness may lead to social discomfort, to loss of business, and perhaps even to graver hardships. In the case of John Bright it cost him on one occasion the loss of his seat, and, on another, retirement from the Cabinet. For most of us it means nothing worse than setting ourselves, from time to time, against the tide of popular feeling. It is here probably that some of the best work for

peace can be done. We need to denounce a foreign policy of greed and aggression as dishonouring to our country, and to advocate one of justice and goodwill.

Patriotism is a word with sinister associations. It awaits redemption from the base uses to which it has been put. Instead of using the word as a synonym for greed and lust of empire, it must be consecrated to actions worthy of England's great name. The men who drag their country's honour in the mud by "Jameson raids" and the oppression of native races, earn thereby no title to be called patriots. The true lover of his country is jealous of its fame: he will not support any policy that will tarnish its greatness: he will not use it as a stalking horse behind which his own reckless schemes of power and aggrandisement can skulk unnoticed. The crown of a nation's glory is not wrought from the spoils of the conquered, nor from wealth amassed by injustice. Our glory is in our civil and religious liberty, in the moral energy which has struck the shackles from the slave, and relies not on revolution but on truth and justice for the attainment of social reform, in the devotion to duty, and the fair-mindedness which are the moral justification for our empire, in all the finer elements which countless acts of patriotic service, in peace even more than in war, have woven into the fibre of our national character.

The true patriot regards neither the steel-clad fleet nor the "thin red line" as the real source of England's

strength. "The true wealth of states is men, not merchandize. The true function of government is to watch over the growth of good citizens." So writes Bishop Westcott in words that strike at the root of national greed and jingoism. Visible power and dominion are the mere externals of growth; the gauge of progress, the secret of strength, lies in the development of nobility of character, in the multiplication of men after the pattern of the manhood of Jesus Christ, in the ever widening application to national life of the laws of God's righteousness. And this greatness of character will lead not to an aggrandisement prompted by greed and love of power, but to a national life of service, and a patriotism which will seek to administer the high endowments, entrusted to our race, for the benefit of mankind.

We may therefore feel that all work which builds up character and promotes a brotherhood of service is in a real sense patriotic. It has been said, "christianize the individual and society will christianize itself." But while this is the case, it is especially necessary that we should uphold a truer conception of national obligation in matters of foreign policy. We need to declare that honour consists, as Wordsworth says, in "the finest sense of justice which the human mind can frame," and that our place of power and nobility among nations imposes the obligation of acting nobly in all things, according to the motto of chivalry,

noblesse oblige. Lord Salisbury has said : " My definition of our foreign policy is that we ought to behave as any gentleman would behave who wishes to get on well with his neighbour, and it is our business to strain every energy to be considerate in dealing with all with whom we have to deal, and we never should be ashamed, so far as the interests of this country are duly preserved, to show complaisance and an accommodating spirit to those with whom we have to live."

A policy conceived in this spirit would not rise to the full Christian ideal, but it would be far higher than the popular policy of the day, and in its atmosphere war would quickly die out. The mere renunciation by a nation of greed, aggression and revenge would root out most causes of war.

It is our task to advocate the policy of peace, the key-note of which is to be found in that fundamental maxim of law and ethics: "Do as you would be done by." Roman law enjoined men "to live honourably; to wrong no one; to give everyone his due." Obedience to this simple code would revolutionize international life. Justice would replace force, forbearance and courtesy would drive out harshness. Very much can be done to promote this higher policy,—at all events in our own country.

Public opinion, expressing itself upon any question with respect to which it has been fully informed, speaks with an

authority that compels almost instant obedience. And there is no public opinion so sane and sober in its conclusions as that of Great Britain. It scouted the idea of war between England and the United States over the Venezuelan question ; it gave a swift condemnation of the Jameson raid ; it kept its head over Fashoda and China ; it supports the Peace Conference ; it suppresses Sunday newspapers.

We have every reason to trust the opinion of the country, if only it is properly instructed as to the issues of right and wrong. This work of instruction is done very imperfectly by the newspaper press, some organs of which pander to the lowest passions of their readers, others reproduce the shoddy morality of the man in the street, and only a few use worthily their high place of influence. It should also be done far more than is the case by the Christian church, on whom rests the duty, not only of proclaiming general truths, but of applying Christian teaching to the actual life of the individual and the nation. We are accustomed to hear it said that the pulpit has nothing to do with politics. The pulpit has nothing to do with the bitterness of feeling, the distortion of facts, the appeal to unworthy motives and interests which disfigure much of party politics : but it is surely the place from which to teach, with application to the circumstances of the times, the great principles upon which true national greatness depends.

It may be worth while to venture an enumeration of a few of the principles that should actuate the "gentlemanly" national policy, for which we are convinced the public opinion of our country is ripe :

1. It will not act on the impulse or in the heat of passion, but with patience and forbearance, and, if possible, so as not to wound national susceptibilities.
2. It will, as far as possible, judge its own case impartially, and urge it temperately and frankly, without finesse or sharp practice, and will be careful not to colour it by intentional overstatement.
3. It will make allowance for national prejudices and the difference in point of view of the other party.
4. It will not allow jealousy or a desire for aggrandisement to prevail over justice.
5. It will be always disposed to entertain any proposals for a settlement, by mediation, arbitration, or direct compromise, which are honourable to both parties.
6. It will be satisfied with simple reparation, and will decline to inflict punishment, or take vengeance, or extort terms which go beyond what is fair.
7. It will in no case add to the bitterness of defeat by measures of humiliation, which can only breed hatred and thirst for vengeance.

Bishop Westcott has stated much of the foregoing in the following admirable sentences :—

“We may strive to understand better the gifts, the duties, and the difficulties of other nations ; and we may, if we are called to judge in our own case, learn to exercise the most severe impartiality. I often wish we could introduce into our treaties a clause which I believe William Penn introduced into his treaty with the Indians, in which the contracting parties bound themselves solemnly not to believe evil reports which were circulated about either side. We can also refrain from exercising any judgment adverse to another nation without full investigation. We must not use language which is not perfectly reconcilable with the respect due to their national dignity. And, if we are forced to become judges in our own cause, surely, then, we shall feel that the obligation is laid upon us to act in the spirit of judges to weigh the ends, the means, the rights, the principles which are involved ; and above all things to discountenance what is so common—a vague appeal to national honour. The honour of a nation, like the strength of a nation, in the long run, is a nation’s righteousness.”

This temper of mind is one worthy of a great nation. The habit, so common among strong nations and privileged classes, of riding rough-shod over others who are less favoured, belongs to the bully rather than the gentleman. The man of true nobility will not bend, “but in magnanimous meekness.” He refrains from pushing his rights to their utmost limit, especially with those weaker than

himself. He would rather lose a little than imperil his character for integrity and fairness.

If we judge questions of foreign policy in this kind of way, the issues of right and wrong soon stand out clearly. We see, for instance, that patience is the quality needed in respect to the Transvaal difficulty, and that our country will dishonour itself by playing the part of a bully. We learn to distrust prancing proconsuls, filibustering speculators, and pushful statesmen, and to appreciate a man of steady temperature and massive build like Lord Salisbury, who can hold on his way, unruffled by snarling critics and fevered Jingoës. Above all, we gain a conception of England's place and duty, upon which we can build a patriotism which shall be no longer heathen but Christian.

We have now referred to the two main topics that were on our minds—the duty of investigation, and the duty of advocating the higher conception of national duty in foreign policy, and of influencing public opinion to require that this higher standard should be adhered to.

There remain one or two subjects on which we wish to say a few words. In devoting work to such an elevation of public opinion as is now practicable, we need neither surrender nor conceal our own conviction that all war is unlawful to the Christian. The propagation of this

truth, among Christians, is a most important piece of work. The downfall of war has indeed been chiefly delayed by the unfaithfulness of the church. Men test Christianity by its capacity for grappling with the great social questions of the age. It claims to be a force with spiritual power to renovate the world, and it can only justify the claim by confronting and overthrowing the great evils which from time to time seem to dominate the earth. The church exists to promote the Kingdom of God, and we have, therefore, every right to claim its help. If we can make the cause of peace triumph in the church, the church can make it triumph in the world. An aroused Christian conscience means an enlightened foreign policy. The church of Christ, which in the early centuries openly denounced war, and in the middle ages acted often as a peace-maker, has for over three centuries spoken with an uncertain and hesitating voice. The hope expressed by John Bright, forty-five years ago, is, however, now in gradual process of fulfilment, the hope that the churches of England, awaking from their slumbers, would gird up their loins to the work of peace. To stimulate this awakening and quicken this activity are tasks that need our vigilant effort.

Much also needs doing in connection with the education of children and the teaching of history. Children are naturally omnivorous: they learn from everything and everybody around them. Parents take good care not to

pamper a boy's appetite : they are under an equally binding responsibility not to pamper his passions. A child whose mind is fed on tin soldiers and stories of battle and bloodshed, is in the same dyspeptic condition as one who is always eating tarts and cakes. The mind must have its fit diet, which, by the silent education of custom, it will learn to love. To indoctrinate a country's children with the teaching that nations are for mutual service, and not for mutual hindrance and disservice ; that war is the natural outcome of injustice ; that the moral law was not written for men alone in their individual character, but also for nations, who will reject it at their peril ; that civilization is lifting man from a state of brute force into a state of law, and Christianity is slowly bringing in that highest of all laws, the law of love ; that force has no place in settling a question of right ; and that there are higher fields for self-sacrifice and heroism in men and nations than the battlefield : to let in these great truths would be to flood the coming age with a blaze of light. We can teach them readily enough, by a thousand natural instances, to young hearts whose ears are not yet sealed to the music of truth, whose souls still lie open for the seed and dew of heaven, when older lives, already deafened by the tumult of the world, and hardened by its traffic, will not heed the message. A generation nurtured on the principles of peace could not stoop in its manhood to the infamy of war.

There is another part of training which is equally important. We must direct the imagination and aspirations of children along the avenues of peace. Is heroism for ever to be linked with the battlefield, a nation's greatness to be measured by its armaments, strength to be associated with self-assertion and self-aggrandisement? The ideal career must no longer be that of the soldier. The noble qualities that cluster round him have found an immeasurably grander example in the Lord Jesus Christ. We need to lift His life up as the ideal, the representative life for mankind, and if He is honestly lifted up, in life and word, by Christians, He will draw all men unto Him. In this lies the redemption, from the captivity of Satan into the captivity of Christ, of all that is noble and soul-inspiring in the character of the soldier. Let boys be bred up as soldiers of Jesus Christ.

In school-life the teaching of history offers great opportunities for inculcating lessons of peace. Text-books of history are, however, too often prepared so as to concentrate attention on wars, and to pass over many more vitally important facts of national life. The treatment of the War of Independence in American histories has done much to perpetuate ill-will towards England, and our own feelings towards France have been largely embittered by the vindictive spirit in which wars with France have been narrated.

Far too little is made of some of the great victories of peace, which should be "no less renowned than war," and

little prominence is given to that moral lesson which is written across the face of all history :—

“Where empires towered that were not just,
Lo! the skulking wild fox scratches in a little heap of dust.”

The preparation of good historical text-books, conceived in a spirit of true Christian patriotism, would be a splendid contribution to the cause of peace.

We have only glanced at a few of the many directions in which peace work is needed. At the Peace Congress at Berne, M. Louis Ruchonnet enforced in eloquent language the duty of organising peace. “If all the voices of humanity that plead for peace were raised unitedly—the voice of the pulpit, the voice of the court of justice, of the workshop, of the field and of the fireside—do you not think that they would be at last listened to, as they declared that men were tired of cutting one another’s throats? Before the pressing danger, our first duty should be to enrol humanity under our banner. Peace societies should be founded everywhere, adhesions should be gathered in, a bond of common action among the masses should be created, thus producing a true public opinion which would compel governments to obey its voice.” Much has been done toward the accomplishment of this hope ; much has still to be done. Our position cannot be one of mere negation. The activities of peace must drive out and replace the

activities of war. We must change the out-worn motto, *si vis pacem para bellum*, which fourteen centuries have refuted, into the truer watchword, "if you wish peace, prepare peace;" and when the way of peace has been prepared, we know that its advent will not be long delayed. Progress may seem slow, but the fruit will be brought forth through patience. We dare not speak of failure, for the cause and the battle are the Lord's, and with Him is assured victory.

"Failure? While tide-floods rise and boil
Round cape and isle, in port and cove,
Resistless, star-led from above;
What though our tiny wave recoil?"

II.

Review.

ILLINGWORTH'S PERSONALITY: HUMAN AND DIVINE.*

IT is not difficult to discern, in the title of Mr. Illingworth's book, a hint of the line of argument which he adopts in treating of the subject of personality. From that mysterious, undefinable conviction, which everyone possesses of their own individuality, he leads us gradually on to grasp the conception of a Personal God. Beginning with human personality, and describing its triple nature—a union of reason, will, and love,—its reality, spirituality, and mystery, the author passes on to trace the history of the conception of Divine personality, from its vague dawning amid pre-historic races, through the pages of Greek philosophers, Hebrew prophets, and Christian Fathers. The well-known arguments for the existence of God are next discussed, and this leads up to one of the most interesting chapters in the book, that which deals with the qualities needful for the right appreciation of a person, and particularly of a Divine Person. Two lectures on pre-historic and pre-Christian religion are followed by a final one on the Incarnation.

* *The Bampton Lectures for 1894*, by J. R. Illingworth, M.A. London: Macmillan, 1898. Price 6s.

Such is the bald outline of a book full of suggestive thoughts, and well worthy of careful study. The subject of personality is, in itself, one of much attraction and widespread interest. It meets us in the æsthetic sphere. What are all works of art, if not subtle manifestations of the artist's self? It meets us as we try to thread the economic mazes of our day. Is it well, we ask, that machinery should turn industrial workers into mere machinists, and eliminate from the daily toil all that self-expression which is the blessing of labour? We meet it, perhaps rather feel it, when, in despair at defining "charm of character," we call this phrase to our aid. But it is with the religious aspect of the question that we are now engaged.

In an age when heredity and social surroundings are too often made the scape-goats for our own and other people's sins, it is perhaps well to be reminded that, after all due deductions and allowances, there is still a residuum of individual responsibility, which cannot be ignored so long as we can say "I am I." In dealing with this inner sense the writer, very wisely, refuses to be wholly satisfied with reasoning purely syllogistic in form, and aptly quotes, in self-defence, Bacon's pregnant words, "Syllogistic reasoning is utterly inadequate to the subtlety of nature" (p. 82), as also Pascal's beautiful saying, "The heart has reasons of its own, which the reason does not know" (p. 80). Strong words these, and not to be used on all occasions. They are

not to be taken as conscience-salves for those who are content with false reasoning, those who subordinate their love of truth to the love of their own particular view of truth, who, when logically defeated, cover their retreat by saying—"I can't explain it, but I know it is so." Truly theirs is no enviable position. Nor are such pleas to be urged in behalf of statements like Cardinal Newman's, that declare the tendency of the reason (*i.e.*, "considering the faculty of reason actually and historically"), to be "towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion" an argument which shews scant reverence for the mind's Creator.*

But there are others who suffer from an opposite defect; they will not trust themselves to any belief which does not bear the full credentials of formal logic; they say if only someone would come to them, and make clear to their intellect, and their intellect only, that there is a personal God, that they would willingly believe in Him. Such a position, as Mr. Illingworth shews, is essentially untenable. If, in order to know another human being, there must be some advances on our part, desire, perseverance, open-mindedness, how much more must such qualities be called into play when it is a question of endeavouring to draw near to *the* Personality? The passages are very interesting which argue for the necessity of devoting the whole nature, moral force as well as reason, to this high quest, and

* *Apologia*, p. 243, *cf.* Fairbairn's *Catholicism*, p. 125.

very beautiful the pleading for penitence as a preparation, and a "progressive and life-long effort of the will" as a *sine-qua-non*.*

It will thus be seen, by reference to the book, how necessary is the use of all the three factors in human personality, reason, will, and love ; not one can be allowed to remain idle, not one can plead that it has no duty to perform. That one or another is far too often unused by those who are unable to find a sure ground for faith, needs no elaborate proof.

But it would be unfair to lay stress on this part of the book only, and to treat the question merely from the point of view of man's striving to know his Creator. The other side of the question is practically the old argument, "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" If personality is the highest attribute, the deepest reality of man's being, were it not mockery to talk of an impersonal God? The quotation from Lotze, on page 53, may be given in reply :

* For the part played by the will in the effort of belief, cf. Professor James' admirable book *The Will to Believe*.

The author of *Riddles of the Sphinx* gives well the philosophical arguments for the right use of the feelings. On page 144 he says : "Thought and feeling are alike activities of the Self," and it is the recollection of this fact that, "affords us the inestimable gain of enabling us to burst through the fetters of Scepticism, and to clear the road for further progress."

“In point of fact, we have little ground for speaking of the personality of finite beings ; it is an ideal, and, like all that is ideal, belongs unconditionally only to the Infinite. Perfect personality is in God only ; to all finite minds there is allotted but a pale copy thereof ; the finiteness of the finite is not a producing condition of this personality, but a limit and hindrance of its development.”

These words are important as pointing to the further progress of Mr. Illingworth's argument. Human personality with him, as with Lotze, is not an attribute of man's incompleteness, the brand of a slave ; rather is it that which tells of his spiritual relation, the mark of his high descent. Man is a person because God is personal, and not *vice versa*. Now it has been argued that to attribute personality to God is to circumscribe and to limit Him, to drag the idea of Deity down to the level of humanity, and we ought therefore to strip off these degrading additions, and to think of the ultimate power of the universe as some abstraction of thought, a far off “First Cause,” a dim and lifeless “Unknowable” or “Unknown.” And in consequence of such a line of argument, it is easy to feel little need to concern ourselves with the matter ; the question of the existence, even, of such a God will hardly touch our lives in their ordinary course. Through bewildering mazes like these it is the lot of some to pass ; they are dreary wastes, and barren of the hopes and aspirations that spring up in

happier places. But it is needless to linger here, for the book before us is a refutation of such mistaken reasoning, and is full of life and reality, not of dry metaphysical difficulties. The author is concerned to shew the progressive development of the conception of Divine Personality and to trace, in the history of religion, the justification and enlargement of the instinct, which led primitive man to personify the powers above him. And if the instinct was true which bade men look up to a Someone instead of a mere Something, we shall find this idea becoming more clear and fertile as the race advances ; we shall be justified, also, in demanding of that teaching, which professes to be the key-stone to all former faiths, that its utterance shall be clear upon this subject. No one will doubt that the message of Christianity is the message of the Father's love : both these two words imply personality. Love loses all meaning unless it be personal—even our love of animals is possible because of that individuality and particularity of character in them, which is akin to the self in us. The word Father, however, will carry us a step further, since it reminds us of that essential of personality—its self-expression. We recognise this quality in our every-day life, and brand the character that is too lifeless, too colourless, or too inert to affect others as deficient in personality, whilst we hold him to be full of it whose inner life finds adequate expression in the outer world. If, then, God is truly our Father, One whom we may come to and know, we may reasonably expect

that He will come near to us in some form of self-expression which it is possible for us, in a measure, to apprehend. That this is the whole or only meaning of the Incarnation is not contended. We are not concerned here with much that is most precious to us in the life and death of Christ, but we are seeking to get glimpses of that aspect of it which appeals not only to our sin-stricken souls, but also to our thinking minds. Hence our triumphant belief that in the end, even if not yet, the stateliest philosophy, in company with the humblest Magdalene, will realise the need of Christ, "the image of the invisible God."

Two short quotations must suffice to give some idea of this part of the book. "Now the doctrine of the Trinity . . . is, in fact, the most philosophical attempt to conceive of God as Personal. Not that it arose from any mere processes of thinking. These, as we have seen, all stopped short of it. It was suggested by the Incarnation, considered as a new revelation about God, and thought out upon the lines indicated in the New Testament" (p. 67). Again, "And this new insight into the divine nature threw a new light upon the destiny of man, as capable, through the Incarnation, of being made holy in the Beloved, and so raised from the level of pity to be partaker of the eternal love of God. Thus the actual Trinity of God explains the potential trinity of man ; and our anthropomorphic language follows from our theomorphic minds" (p. 214).

It will be easily gathered from this brief description that the book is for those whose minds, by their very nature, must dwell upon the mysteries of being. For those of a more practical turn it has little to offer ; but to those who are impelled to think, it will come as a great help to constructive views, and the author's contention that "thought as a whole does not tend towards the abstract, but towards the concrete," that "it penetrates the dull mass of life till the whole becomes luminous and glows," that "it is an inseparable element of the highest life, or, rather, it is life raised to its highest power," will encourage them to use this faculty to the best advantage.

To take the weapons of intellect out of the hands of the sceptic and to place them in those of the believer is no mean work, and we may gladly welcome this honest attempt so to do, trusting that it may meet the mental difficulties of some, and for others may make surer and more broad the basis of their faith.

JOAN MARY FRY.

I.

The Summer School.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL.

THE Birmingham gathering is drawing near. Some may be looking forward to it as a new experience ; some feel that for them there can never be a repetition of the time spent at Scarborough ; some, perhaps, are anxious as to its success ; others are critical or indifferent. Thus there arises, in many minds, the question of its value and place in our midst, and it may be well to consider the meaning of such a gathering, and, if possible, to clear our ideas of what it ought to be and may be made.

Such an attempt may be prefaced, however, by saying what a Summer School is *not*. It is not a meeting which, of necessity, recurs at stated intervals. Unlike our Yearly or Quarterly Meetings, it has no business to transact, and it may well happen that years pass by without a repetition of it. It is not an occasion likely to suit everybody, nor is it a panacea for all the ills of the Society of Friends, of which we hear so much at the present time. And, once again, it is not an opportunity for airing wild views, indulging in criticism for criticism's sake, or for unsettling people's minds.

A community of learners—this is what a Summer School ought to be, and there is more in the demand than may, at first sight, appear. Teachable people are not always most readily found amongst teachers. To a very considerable extent, Friends have taken up the work of teaching. It may be in the Adult Class, with its heavy weekly demands upon mind and spirit; or in the children's class, where the attention of restless little mortals is hard to win and harder still to keep; or it may be in the meeting for worship, depending as it does upon the obedient instrumentality of every member, that Friends learn to be willing to give of their best, and get accustomed to look upon some kind of giving-out as their normal duty. It is undoubtedly right that the Society should be a body of workers: no true disciples of Christ can lay aside their service for Him. But it is dangerous to forget that servants must be humble, and teachers teachable. Receptivity is the charm of childhood—a charm too often lost in later life. We all rejoice in the delightful characters that win us by retaining the “dew of their youth” throughout their mature or declining years, and yet how few of us altogether avoid the temptation to lose the power of learning, or sufficiently strive to keep open, in middle life, the less used avenues to heart and brain? There is much need of humility in this matter—a real humility that recognises its need in order to attain to something higher, not that spurious form which is content with its meanness.

In spiritual matters there is an especial danger of becoming set in our own opinions : we must live by our religion, and day by day work out our lives by so much of Christ's teaching as we have been able to assimilate. Thus, whilst we emphasize some aspects of it, we largely forget others. This may be an individual danger, but there is a common danger as well. There is much, very much to be done in the way of helping others, and it often seems as if there were too few to do that which we long to see accomplished, and, in our impatience, we think it better to do a great deal rather than to give precious time and thought to the due preparation for what we know is our own portion. We try to build with hay or stubble, upon the true foundation, because time fails us to hew stones. Now all teaching is a question of character—character having, and then character giving—and character demands formative as well as expressive opportunities. Would it not be wise, therefore, sometimes to give ourselves time to drink in, to be willing to be taught instead of teaching ; and, as regards the Bible especially, to hear what scholars are thinking about it, and to receive fresh impetus for private study ?

The programme of the Summer School will be found to fall into three main divisions : first, there is the section on Biblical criticism, including such courses as "Israel and Its Enemies," and "The Poetical Literature of the Old Testament." The second section on "Personal Spiritual Illumination" deals with the life and teachings of St. Francis

of Assisi, and other mystics ; whilst the third suggests some of the practical applications of truth to life, as in discourses on "The Development of Christian Morality" and the "Responsibilities of a Free Ministry."

I. Upon the need of increased study of the Bible it might have seemed superfluous to dwell, had it not been clear that the neglect of this part of equipment for service by Friends in past years has led to a diminution of power in the present. The study has been too often merely traditional ; it has been emotional and unreal, and in consequence the Bible has become to some a closed book. A forced spiritualising of the words of Scripture may have fed the feelings, but the realities of life and history are stern, and feelings alone prove unstable foundations for truth in action. We want to get at what the Bible really says and means, not at what people wish it to say and mean, or at what people have always thought it said and meant. Modern methods have not dealt tenderly with traditional views : some scholars have attempted to re-write the Bible, and seem to have revelled in turning everything out of its accustomed place. Scepticism has not been slow to make use of this rough handling : it has tried to make it appear that the chief glory of such work is to prove the history of the Fall a myth, and so to alter the dates of the prophets as to destroy the idea of prophecy. It would be unwise, as well as untrue, to deny the existence of these destructive tendencies in some Biblical critics. It must

be remembered that a certain amount of disturbance is always created in the minds of men whenever the boundaries of knowledge are enlarged. It needs courage to move forward, leaving a partial view of truth for one of wider scope. But if the Society of Friends is afraid to make this forward move, to keep its place with "the van and the freemen," and prefers to "sink to the rear and the slaves," its share of the work will have to be done by others. The Bible will not remain a closed book. Over and over again has the dust of tradition almost obscured its meaning, but by friend or foe it has been shaken off, and men have turned to the history of God's revealings with a newly quickened interest.

The heart of the matter lies here. The destructive work of criticism is as nothing compared with its capacity for positive good ; if it does at times overthrow cherished views, it is only (I speak of true criticism) that it may sink the foundations of belief deeper in the life of man. A profound faith in the Bible welcomes all that helps to elucidate it. History and archæology, the study of language and ethnography, science and literature may all be made to contribute to this end and to shew something more of its hidden stores. There is no subtler symptom of the weakness of unbelief than fear. Let not those who fear investigation think themselves the sole guardians of truth : those most deeply convinced of their beliefs will not shrink when the search-light of critical study is poured upon the Scriptures : it will enable them the better to see the

props and pillars upon which has been reared, throughout all ages, the temple of faith : it will teach them much of the far-reaching nature of God's dealings with men : it will give them the patience of strength as they understand something more of the very diverse elements made use of by the Holy Spirit as His instruments. Above all, as the impossibilities of the dwarfing, mechanical theory of verbal inspiration become more clear, there steals over the mind a growing sense of what Christ meant when He spoke about being always with His disciples.

It would be impossible here to enumerate the many ways in which it is hoped that the Summer School studies may stimulate the growth of the inner life, but if the Bible is indeed "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," surely it behoves us to be more than passive onlookers in the attempt to bring its teaching home to all men. It is no mere scepticism or indifference, it is not even the "eternal hate to falsehood" that lies at the root of this movement. Rather seek it in an enthusiasm that dares not to despair of truth.

"But one vow links us ever,
That, whatsoe'er shall be,
Nor life nor death shall sever
Our souls, O Truth, from Thee."

II. Turning now to the second section, we are agreed that the Bible demands much in the way of study. We Summer

Scholars insist upon this ; we feel it worth while to set aside some of our ordinary duties in order that we may the better fulfil this one. But this is not all ; mediately through the Scriptures comes to us the revelation of Christ, immediately it is still given by His Holy Spirit. Teachableness of heart is as necessary as receptivity of mind : hence the need to balance critical study with thoughts upon the personal illumination of the human soul. This second section, dealing with the lives of some great mystics, is intended to lead the mind to dwell upon that which lies behind the Bible itself, to counteract the deadness of mere date-hunting, and to emphasize the reality of inspiration. All that can lead into this inner sanctuary will surely be welcome, and never more so than when we are full of the wonder and complexity of what may be called the outward revelation.

It is to this mystical side of life that we must look for that power which shall help to banish haste and superficiality from our work. It cannot be denied that the temptation is great to work with feverish haste because the time is short, and the needs vast beyond our power to estimate, but the ideal servant of the kingdom will remember that the work is "too great for haste, too high for rivalry," and the gathering of workers at Birmingham will not meet to talk about their work, or to advertise their own methods.

It is not a conference, but a school : we go, not so much to shew each other those things which we may have already

found, as to learn a deeper need and to seek a fuller filling, in whatever way that may come. For "the ways unto God are as the number of the souls of the children of men."

III. The third section is practical, and should be doubly interesting as the complement to the more theoretical ones that precede it. The right application of thought to life can never be a dull subject. There is a real desire, latent in the most inconsistent, to know how to make their lives a clearer utterance of the ideal within; and when, as it is hoped will be the case at Birmingham, the ideal has been cleared and made more vivid, we may well ask for some help in the definite realization of that purified ideal. The subjects chosen will be somewhat varied, and it is needless here to repeat the programme. One subject, however, is of paramount importance to Friends—that of the Ministry. Many are the dangers that beset it—dangers, on the one hand, of a narrow insistence upon certain truths, to the exclusion of others, or, on the other hand, of a vagueness which leaves life unchanged and insincere: temptations to have preaching at all costs, feeble if we are too lazy to seek for strength, paid for if unpaid preachers cannot be had. It is easy to comment upon such things: comment and criticism, however, are but signs, albeit hopeful ones, of the widespread desire for a truer, deeper, more converting Ministry: they do not necessarily solve the difficulty. To realise the responsibilities of freedom would, we believe, be a real step

gained. We must understand that to leave and be left alone is merely negative, that indifference and broad-mindedness are not synonymous, and that no slavery can ask of us such sacrifices as a free man will learn to give. When we have learned to accept the duties, we may perhaps allow ourselves to be proud of the title of those who 'preach Christ of free will.

We believe ourselves to be expressing the intentions of the Committee when we say that their desire has been so to arrange the programme as to meet very varied tastes, whilst at the same time giving to the whole a unity, which they believe will help to emphasize the central idea of the School. From all misrepresentation or one-sided presentation of truth, from all differences of view, or deficiencies in appreciating others' opinions, we may scarcely hope to be wholly free, but we may and do trust that one aim may animate us all—to draw nearer to each other, as from our far-away isolation we are drawn nearer to Christ, the Truth.

Review.

THE YEARLY MEETING'S LETTER ON WORSHIP AND MINISTRY.*

IT is refreshing to feel the breath of liberty across these pages. With all the careful avoidance of too explicit statement which characterizes official utterance, this letter seems to open another "window to the day." The whole burden of the discussion on the Ministry which took place during Yearly Meeting was—How may we best meet the growing needs of our meetings for worship? How may we remove those causes of failure which too often "dishonour the nobility of the truth which we profess"? The discussion was far from being an academic debate: amid frank differences of opinion the Yearly Meeting recognised that some practical effort must be made, that we are suffering from a lack of proper organisation in reference to our meetings for worship, and a lack of religious teaching among our own members. At the same time the need for a deeper unity, and an increase in spiritual solidarity, fellowship, and communion, was widely recognised.

After defining the central position of our meetings for worship in the life of the Society, the Letter before us emphasises the truth that even the loftiest ideal can accomplish little where spiritual vigour is lacking. A meeting-together can only be a true meeting for worship when we unite in spirit to seek and to distribute the Bread of Life. The satisfaction of our own need for comfort or quietness is not sufficient: every member of

* *A Letter from London Yearly Meeting on Ministry and Oversight, 1899, to the Congregations and Individual Members of the Society of Friends.*

a meeting must share in some way in the ministry of the meeting. Otherwise we cannot have a living service, and shall be ashamed to invite others to come amongst us. A living meeting does not only open its doors to all, but eagerly endeavours to bring in those outside. Where an active spirit of ministry pervades the whole meeting, and is the felt influence of its spiritual communion, there will be neither lifeless silence nor unsuitable speech. And upon no other basis than this can the true freedom of the ministry be maintained. Under the general covering of the Spirit divine guidance will be found, and messages will be clear, comprehensible, and directed to the needs of those present. Weighty ministry is not the prerogative of any class or age; it is the gift of earnest hearts, and bears the stamp of authority given by spiritual experience. As this gift may be received by all, those Friends who feel their meeting destitute of the spiritual food which seems needful for it are lovingly encouraged to consider whether this is not a call to them to minister to that need. Many meetings require more of a ministry helpful to those in intellectual doubt, and for this, study and sympathy are alike requisite. Congregations are recommended to provide suitable libraries, and to encourage social intercourse. We need a wider outlook on men and thought; clearer perception, larger sympathy. And especially we want a fuller consecration of intellectual powers. There is a large field for the "teaching ministry." We must not limit the spirit, or quench any form of spiritual activity. Our meetings need a more comprehensive exercise of *all* faculties for spiritual ends. Some fear license, and are fallen into a deadly routine. But from this fear and deadness we must escape if we are to share in the work of Christ. Let us rely upon His presiding Presence, and upon the good feeling of the congregation to harmonise the varying forms of ministry. We need a better distribution of vocal ministry among our meetings. Our smaller meetings are little provided with a "teaching ministry"; and this lack should be met. As a Society we must see that our members receive due training in religious knowledge.

Such we believe to be the gist of this Letter. It is a plea for freedom and for reality. It is also a much-needed recognition of the ministry of the intellect, and the importance of religious teaching. Our failure "is in our want of consecration";—let us not make unnecessary antagonism between head and heart, but seek a fuller consecration of both sides of our nature. For the demands of a free ministry are large and inclusive. Above all it needs vitality,—that breath of life which is the free breath of the spirit. Without vitality we cannot avoid failure, and our ministry cannot attain to vitality unless we bring to it every gift of mind, circumstance, and experience.

In acknowledging a degree of failure this Letter certainly strikes no note of discouragement. In societies, as in individuals, a wholesome sense of shortcoming is a ground of hope and the beginning of reform. Danger lay in the optimism which indignantly repudiated all sense of failure, considering that the Society of Friends is satisfactorily accomplishing its mission. Other cause for hope is to be found in the reforms suggested by the Home Mission Committee, to bring about the closer association of the Society with those under its influence in Meetings, Mission Meetings, and Adult Schools. Such breaking down of barriers may be viewed without alarm when caused by the outbursting spirit of a larger life within. The passion of fellowship may yet rescue "proselytism" from sinister associations and give it a new and holier meaning. In that day we trust the Society of Friends may become a truly proselytizing body. At least Evangelicalism abhors exclusiveness, and the evangelical spirit slowly rises in our branch of the Church like sap at the call of summer. The Society of Friends begins to proffer its church-fellowship to those among whom its influence is felt. It is ceasing to be an exclusive religious club in order that it may become a living member of the Church Universal.

The Letter should be read in conjunction with the report of the discussion in the Meeting on Ministry and Oversight, and that in the Yearly Meeting on the State of the Society. These revealed the

irregular distribution of acknowledged ministers, and the non-acknowledgment of young ministers. One speaker stated that half our recorded ministers are over sixty years of age, and often quite unable to participate in that itinerant ministry which did so much to build up and sustain the Society in the past. It is said that only twenty-five recorded ministers are on the "active list" in London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, while in this respect the condition of Durham Quarterly Meeting is even worse. It was considered very desirable that the Society should do more to acknowledge and wisely direct the vocal ministry of its younger members. This question of the direction of the ministry was raised by several speakers. The office of eldership is of the very highest consequence, and the vocal ministry has often suffered much through the reticence of elders. This directing office may be exercised without hindering the freedom of the Spirit, which is incompatible with license for the individual. Where there is a lack of spiritual fellowship in a meeting the usual liberty of speech becomes a grave danger. The free ministry depends upon unity in the Spirit.

Friends recognised that it is not so much "culture" as the consecration of "culture" which we need. There is much "culture" unemployed among us. We require a conception of the ministry in which there will be a place for all our science and knowledge.

Again, it was felt that the high privilege and deep responsibility of participation in the vocal ministry should have fuller appreciation. The claims of business or philanthropy should not prevent us devoting leisure and thought to the special claims of our meetings for worship. One cannot but recall John Woolman's renunciation of profitable developments in his business because he felt they would interfere with the higher ministry to which he was called.

One of the many hopes aroused by these discussions and this Letter on the Ministry is that such work as that of the Summer Schools may

be increasingly recognised as among the proper work of the whole Society. Such collective training in religious knowledge as the Schools and their Continuation Lectures have inaugurated may well become an important part of our Quarterly or Monthly Meeting duties.

And another and final thought arises, that the failure to realize the power of the Spirit in many a meeting for worship is consequent upon the existence of some non-religious element in the life of its members. How can a meeting be conscious of the presence of Christ in His full power of attraction and conversion unless the daily pursuits of its members conform to the laws of the Kingdom of God? The larger and more spiritual conception of the ministry reveals to us how all our activities may become parts of one whole, and how, until they thus co-operate, our week's work must hinder and must tend to stultify our work of Divine Service.

Robert Barclay of Ury.

NOTE.—The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

Editorial Note.

WE print in this issue an appreciation of Robert Barclay the Apologist, by a thoughtful Minister of another denomination. We feel that his criticism of our theological weakness is just. We lack a proper appreciation of the significance of our past history as it applies both to problems of the present and the future. We are largely ignorant of our heritage, and possess but a feeble intellectual grasp on our spiritual ideals. This condition has a direct influence on the problem of our Ministry, and on our failure to draw thoughtful men and women into membership with us. While we need and desire an increase in spiritual power, we also need to direct the power we possess with greater intelligence and knowledge.

Too much has been made of the undenominational position suggested in the plea for "Christians first, and Friends afterwards," and the statement that "it is more important to bring men to Christ than to make them Friends." While these phrases have at first hearing a broad and tolerant ring, they proceed from a superficial view of Quakerism, and assume an antithesis between it and Christianity which does not exist. This view, coupled with a false humility which deprecates any public advocacy of our church (as distinct from the advocacy of separate principles), has contributed to our present weakness.

If we really understood our past history and the application of our principles to modern life we should not accept this attitude. We should rejoice in a robust and manly aggression, believing that it is our work to bring men to a knowledge of Christ as clear and full as that of George Fox and John Woolman, rather than to present Him in the crude

It is not, then, in any sectarian spirit that we desire to see the Society of Friends earnestly grapple with this problem.

The task before us is to vindicate the primitive, and, as we also believe, the ultimate ideal of the free ministry. To accomplish such a task is to perform a service to the whole Church of Christ, for while the freedom of our constitution seems specially to equip us for this service, the solution of the problem will exercise a profound influence far beyond the limits of our Society.

We desire to make this explanation, believing that many of our readers share in our distaste for any argument based upon mere sectarian or denominational grounds. We would have it clearly understood that where we speak of "denominational" or "sectarian" matters, in the present essay or elsewhere, we entirely dissociate ourselves from the attitude of mind in which such subjects are usually approached. Our concern is for the Truth revealed to the Society of Friends, not for the sake of the Society but for the sake of the Truth. We cannot, however, forget that Truth requires a living vehicle, and seeks its manifestation through the fellowship of holy souls.

We believe that the most immediate and practical service for Friends is to maintain their church as a free spiritual fellowship, where Truth may find an active manifestation, unshackled by the fetters of mere tradition or of out-worn creeds.

THE PROBLEM OF A FREE MINISTRY.

STIRRED by a general sense of shortcoming, the recent Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends published a pastoral letter on Worship and Ministry. Both the letter and the discussion which gave rise to it provide us with helpful and encouraging suggestions, but neither claim to solve the problem which a free ministry presents. If these suggestions to individuals are to have their full value, we must go further, and consider what are the conditions of life in the church at large to foster a strong ministry.

But in thus approaching our subject, let us briefly anticipate two questions :—

- (1) Is a free Ministry a vital element in our conception of public worship ?
- (2) Is the Quaker conception of public worship of essential and permanent value ?

In the pastoral letter already referred to, we are told that “an active attitude of soul is of the very essence of a good meeting.” This means that we recognize

what has been well called "the divine work of worship," the need for that individual exercise of spirit without which there can be no true communion with God. We ignore the outward help of ritual and of a set service, because we lay the stress on this supreme individual necessity. Our silent waiting is the opportunity for the prisoned soul to escape into the freedom of spiritual intercourse.

Friends do not assert that ceremonial precludes true spiritual communion. But they believe that in the course of history symbolism has always tended to become a hindrance rather than an aid to spiritual worship, and that an ordered service, however dignified and uplifting, offers an inadequate and an inelastic substitute for the immediate dependence of the soul upon God.

Apart from all sacerdotal pretensions, which we reject as contrary to the teaching of Jesus, we hold that to limit the service of the vocal ministry to one person, or to a separate class, is not, as is commonly maintained, a necessary condition of church life.

The freedom of the ministry prevalent in the early days of the Christian Church, is still the ideal, and its restriction in the interests of order and dignity, even if justified on the ground of human infirmity, cannot fairly be presented as a survival of the *ideally* fittest or as a

stage in *ideal* development. The surrender of the "lay" ministry involved the quenching of the Spirit, the closing of the door against the divine call to prophecy. Friends believe that the restriction of the ministry is at best but a stage to be outgrown, and that it is their office to seek the reinstatement of the higher ideal. The doctrine of immediate dependence carries with it the diffusion of responsibility and an emphasis on "the divine work of worship" which ought powerfully to combat those tendencies to parasitism and to worship by proxy which a pre-arranged service necessarily invites.

In spite of our acknowledged weakness this ideal has been a source of strength in our Society. It is to this special sense of the share and responsibility of the individual in the work of worship, that we must largely attribute that force of character which has given the Society of Friends an influence out of proportion to its numbers.

A free ministry, then, is a vital element in our conception of worship.

But, in the second place, can we further claim that our conception of worship is of essential and permanent value?

To find our answer we need only study the widely prevailing tendency towards more elaborate ceremonial,

and the facility with which the element of real worship is lost in musical or other services which do not appeal to the spiritual faculties. This is an age of pleasure. Religion must be dressed in pleasing raiment or it is rejected as narrow and intolerant. The Sword of the Word must have a velvet scabbard: the inexorable realities of spiritual law must be hidden in a golden haze. The divine work of worship is too onerous. It must be lightened or evaded by ceremonial or by the offices of a priest. But spiritual consciousness is not the involuntary emotion produced by music or ritual. It is the fruit of a voluntary effort of the soul, and no evasion of spiritual exercise can give us spiritual life.

The clear testimony to this truth afforded by the Society of Friends in their ideal of worship is, then, of essential and permanent value.

But are we in a position to present this ideal not as a beautiful theory but as a living fact? It is when we come to answer this question that we falter, for we know at heart that our meetings for worship are the weakest point in our church life. The responsibility of a free ministry must be carefully considered in the light of this fact, and such consideration will show that the free ministry presents a practical problem which has not yet been solved.

In thus treating our subject as a problem for solution we need scarcely be reminded that nothing can be accomplished without pure life, heart surrender, and spiritual power. If these be absent nothing else can have any value.

It is needful to make this clear at the outset, because those who make practical suggestions are sometimes supposed to confound machinery with power. There are those who feel a deep distrust of any approach to system in matters relating to our meetings for worship. Their attitude of mind is illustrated in its extreme form in the words of a valued Friend, who says :—

“It is very important to remember that no change of organization will put new life into souls, no change of methods can increase the spiritual tone of the community. A man’s surroundings will not improve him. System will not make a healthy church.”

These statements belong to that class of half truths which, unless rightly qualified, are apt to do serious harm. The words are true if we take them to mean that without spiritual power the spiritual machinery of the church is impotent for good. But they are not true if we understand them as implying that changes in organization are valueless even where they are the result of spiritual power intelligently directed. Practical measures, such as

changes in organization, must necessarily affect the church for good or ill. The Friend already quoted virtually admits this in acknowledging that "there are certain indispensable conditions by which alone we can carry the Word of Life to others." Amongst these are mentioned study and meditation. But to secure time for study and meditation in the life of a business man involves the proper arrangement of affairs, and such a change in the organization of a business life may undoubtedly result in a direct access of spiritual power to the church. What applies in this way to the individual applies also to the church as a whole. As already insisted, we shall find, as we seriously study the problem of our ministry both in the light of past history and present conditions, that though the question is primarily one of spiritual power it is certainly one which calls for practical common sense. Spiritual power and church organization are so closely inter-related that they cannot be fully considered apart. The familiar illustration of the Evangelical revival must not be forgotten. Great as was the influence of Whitefield, it would have been largely evanescent but for the organizing genius of Wesley. The fear of what is called the systematizing of spiritual matters is nevertheless entitled to all respect. If the Society of Friends were to become a mere mechanism its day would be over. That point is conceded; the question which remains is the nature

and limit of the organization needful to secure the healthy development of the ministry in our church.

Having thus attempted to clear the ground, we are free to consider our subject as now outlined, and it may help us to escape from traditional ideas to view it for a moment from the standpoint of an outsider.

A member of another denomination, aware that his own clergyman or minister had passed through a severe course of training, and possessed mental equipment and leisure for his service altogether beyond what any layman in his congregation possessed, would probably feel considerable surprise on discovering a group of laymen in the same walk of life as himself content to dispense with the minister and willing to supply the ministry themselves. He would note that these laymen, so far from being men of much leisure or scholarship, were of that class who are chiefly busy all the week in office, warehouse, and shop—perhaps prominent on Town Council or School Board. He would further note that they gave their best energies to an extensive Sunday School work without endeavouring to render this in return a support to the church. He would naturally feel that these men had dared to take upon themselves a very heavy responsibility in thus foregoing the help of a separated ministry and departing from a universal practice. He would wonder how, with all the many

claims pressing upon them, these laymen could find the means and the time to equip themselves for their voluntary service. But his wonder would increase with closer acquaintance as he discovered how few among these busy men gave much time or thought to the ministry, and how readily its claims were permitted to give way to others which were deemed more urgent.

Doubtless some things would favourably impress him. The freedom from monetary considerations would come upon him with a sense of relief. He would at once appreciate the marked service of women's ministry. He would learn to recognize that laymen, unacquainted with Biblical Criticism or modern scholarship, can gather material for helpful sermons in the practical experience of a busy week, and that the effect of such ministry, coming from a manufacturer, or shopkeeper, or artizan, had its peculiar value. He would notice the existence of a spontaneous ministry of real spiritual helpfulness, and of a type impossible under the conditions of his own denomination, and would recognize that, in spite of the disadvantages of scanty leisure and imperfect equipment, some few of their ministers could fill the pulpit of any denomination with distinction. But these considerations could not conceal from him the fact that a large proportion of the ministry failed in its purpose, and lacked that force and application which better equipment

and further knowledge would have given to it, and he would hardly be surprised when he discovered a prevalent sense of shortcoming. Even if he did not condemn the lay ministry as impracticable, he would infer an inadequate conception either of the value and purpose of the ministry or of the self-sacrifice it involves.

Without accepting this sketch (which has been constructed entirely from the actual comments of friendly outsiders) as either accurate or complete, we shall unite in acknowledging that self-sacrifice is the price of our ideal. Without this it would indeed be found, as some have pronounced it, a beautiful but impracticable dream.

Nor does the measure of that self-sacrifice decrease as time goes by. We hardly realize the advantages which the ministers of other denominations enjoy. The rich store of modern scholarship is placed within their reach. Picked men are at their service as teachers and guides. Freed from the worry and distractions of business life, the young man called to the ministry may bend himself whole-heartedly to the work of equipment. Only ignorance will maintain that these advantages are of no moment. At our Summer Schools we learn to measure our loss. Moreover, the standard of training in other churches is being continually raised. The new learning, the work of men of the stamp of Robertson Smith, is beginning to tell. Those who come under this influence

infuse new life into their ministry. Their interpretation of the Bible has a freshness that ours sorely lacks, and the life and teaching of Christ, studied not only in a new aspect, but with unprecedented patience, are no longer presented in conventional phraseology, but with the nervous force of a compelling message.

In this connection we must bear in mind that Friends are no longer restricted in the development of their energies. The abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts opened a field of public and municipal service hitherto closed. Prior to this change it would be more natural to concentrate upon the ministry and to travel largely, as the custom was, in the Service of the Gospel. And now the Adult School has come to assert its claims, and to absorb much of our time and strength. Moreover, our young people have escaped into the outer world. The Quaker Meeting no longer holds the same large place in their imagination. Young Friends have learnt to measure by other standards. They have heard other ministry, and perhaps their hearts have first been reached in places very different from the plain Meeting House. Their loyalty must be held by ties stronger than were deemed sufficient in the times of exclusiveness. For in those days the ministry in other denominations was seldom such as to tempt an envious comparison. But Anglican dulness and the frequent crudity of the

Nonconformist are yielding place to such virile ministry as that of Canon Gore and Dr. Dale.

It may here be objected that learned or eloquent discourses are out of place in a Friends' Meeting, that too much may be made of intellectual equipment, that the Quaker ministry must be of a type by itself, and that in a meeting for worship the importance of the sermon must be relatively small.

But these objections must not be pushed too far. The cause of Christ can best be served when to the consecration of the heart is added the consecration of intellectual gifts. Isaiah teaches us the value of an eloquence sincere and free from artificial taint, and experience shows that meetings which are not fed by thoughtful and uplifting sermons will ultimately languish. Let us remember that the phrase "meeting for worship" does not entirely express the purpose for which we assemble. Whilst mainly for adoration and spiritual communion, it is the chief opportunity for mutual edification and instruction. Further, this is an age when it has become more than ever necessary to command the allegiance of both head and heart, especially of the young. To meet this end we need not only spiritual warmth, but the mental sympathy that is fostered and widened by knowledge.

It is clear upon the briefest survey that the burden of a free ministry is not a light one.

In view of the equipment provided by other denominations, what are our corresponding advantages?

Our Adult Schools, and the valuable lessons of experience learnt in other fields of Christian labour, afford an equipment of an *indirect* character, but it would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that our church ignores the need for an equipment that is *direct*. Everything is left to the sense of individual responsibility. The Quaker minister often serves his meeting at considerable self-sacrifice, but his education, his religious training, and the arrangement of his time, are rarely controlled by any sense of the special qualification which the ministry demands. His education has been of the ordinary middle-class standard; if he has had any definite religious instruction it has been fragmentary; and while he is no less engrossed in business than his neighbour who profits from Sunday to Sunday by the thoughtful sermons of a trained minister, he probably still further curtails his leisure by taking a larger share in the responsibilities of citizenship. He takes on himself more work and receives less instruction. Once in a few years an official exhortation to the ministry from the Yearly Meeting may reach him. His Meeting on Ministry and

Oversight takes no steps to develop his gift, and his Elders mainly confine their office to its negative aspects.

The strong sense of responsibility, and the degree of self-sacrifice which our ministry represents, under these depressing conditions, are an encouraging evidence of life, but the limitations of such haphazard ways are only too obvious. Exhortations to our ministers will not meet the case. Our ministry labours under practical disadvantages which must be met by practical measures. Our present deficiencies cannot be overcome by thus reserving for the ministry the lees of our energy and the fag-ends of our time.

The church must come to close quarters with the problem : How can we maintain a free ministry among busy men, who feel the exacting toll of increasing commercial competition ; and at the same time how can we give to this ministry an intelligence, directness, and attractive force, which, though the ministry may be of a different type from that of other denominations, shall at least render it comparable in effectiveness ?

In attempting to seek an escape from this apparent dilemma, let us briefly consider the attitude of mind that has led us into our present condition. It cannot be maintained that the sole explanation of our incomplete equipment is the absence of a self-sacrificing spirit.

This, no doubt, plays some part, but the fact remains that while many Friends are not alive to the necessity for such equipment, there are others who deprecate it.

We believe the truer explanation lies in that dread of what are called human arrangements, to which we have already had occasion to refer.

This dread rests upon weighty reasons, but it must be clearly recognized that the characteristic note of the Quaker Meeting, with its cherished freedom of spiritual dependence upon God, is endangered not by the intellectual equipment of the ministry, but by its restriction to one man or to one type. It is difficult to over-estimate the extent of the mischief which this dread has wrought. In the first place it has led to a limited view of what constitutes a call to the ministry. It is profoundly true that God does call his servant unexpectedly in the presence of a congregation, and bids him speak unprepared. We may rejoice that Friends have never minimized that supreme prophetic gift. It is also true that no minister can rightly speak without a strong conviction when he rises that what he says is said in season. But the deduction that there can be no call during the week, and no right preparation of the message, is wholly inadmissible. God works in many ways, and Friends living in the freedom of the Spirit should be the last to maintain such an artificial limitation.

The consequences of this mistaken view, now happily losing its hold, have hardly received sufficient recognition. It must be ranked with the dread of "creaturely activity" and the reckless disownments for marrying a non-member as among the three chief causes of disaster in the recent history of our church. To it must be attributed much of our weakness in the intellectual equipment of the ministry. Indeed, in its extreme form, this view has regarded the intellect as an enemy to be fought rather than an ally to be welcomed.

It is to this view also that we must trace the almost entire neglect of the spiritual gift of a teaching ministry. Marks of preparation in a sermon have been resented, and thus, through fear of giving offence, a type of mind that would have lent added definiteness and weight to the ministry has been largely excluded, and it is not too much to say that the removal of this difficulty alone would call much valuable ministry into existence. The mistaken view which practically limits the Quaker ministry to the prophetic type has caused many needlessly to doubt their qualification. We cherish the memory of those rare spiritual gifts which in men like Stephen, Grellet, and Benjamin Seebohm were so powerfully used in the service of truth, but while we do well to value them we cannot rightly assume that lesser gifts do not qualify for service.

Again, we must recognise that the dread of the human element has encouraged the spirit of indolence, and lulled

Friends into a belief that the minister need set no time apart for study or definite meditation.

It is, however, not difficult to see that this fear of preparation has even wider consequences than those already enumerated. It is closely associated with that strange haziness which characterises the mind of the average Friend when questioned as to the historical and spiritual significance of his church. Our ignorance, both as to the facts of our church history with their meaning for the present and the future, and the want of any adequate conception of our spiritual heritage, is not likely to develop the gifts latent amongst us. This haziness has to a considerable extent robbed our ministry of its proper formative influence, and given to our appeal as a church a confused character lacking coherence and a clear-cut outline. A small body like the Society of Friends, which has with almost dramatic suddenness broken down its social barriers and mingled with the world after a century of aloofness, must have very clear convictions if it is not to lose its identity.

We have now discovered our main principle of action in dealing with the problem of the free Ministry. *If there is to be a strong Ministry in our Church, a rich soil must be provided for its growth.*

All questions of the distribution of the ministry, especially in relation to declining meetings or the

establishment of new ones, are of subordinate importance. Something can even now be done in these fields, but until the conditions of church life are so altered that the gift of the ministry is fostered and not discouraged, nothing great can be accomplished. Sooner or later we shall be brought up by the fact that we have not the Friends qualified for the service. As a church we have yet to learn that a minister is *both born and made*.

Assuming, then, that we recognize our need for equipment, how and where is that equipment to begin? Our first preparation for the ministry must be as wide as the church. In accepting the sacred burden of a free ministry we lay it upon every member of the Society of Friends. We must so shape our life that we may bear that burden worthily. We demand more of our members than almost any other church; and we must adopt special measures to qualify them. Our consideration of this first preparation will fall naturally under three heads :—

1. The training of children in Friends' Boarding Schools.
2. The religious training of our young people after leaving school, and of those who are not taught in Friends' Schools.
3. The religious training of our adult members.

(1) *The training of children in Friends' Boarding Schools.*

During a recent visit to America, undertaken with a view to the study of the whole question upon which we are now engaged, the writer was impressed with the clear evidence that where undenominational education prevailed it was telling adversely upon Friends.

We are aware that there are thoughtful Friends on this side of the Atlantic who deprecate any denominational colour being given to our schools. They claim that any distinctive Quaker training must be given exclusively at home and in the Meeting. This, however, will be found insufficient. In many homes the parents are not qualified to supply the needful training, while there is practically no sustained effort in the Meeting to give training which can rightly be called distinctive. In any case the time spent at school covers so large a part of the plastic period of life that the church cannot neglect the valuable opportunity afforded by school instruction.

The objection to denominational education arises from the malpractices which flourish under that name.

We do not mean that our pupils shall be forced by a sort of Jesuitry into accepting statements *ex cathedra*, but we do mean that they shall have pointedly placed before them the practical, spiritual, and non-sacerdotal aspects

of divine truth in relation to individual and national life. In teaching secular history we unhesitatingly deduce the lessons or warnings offered by States founded on slavery or founded on freedom, ruled by despots or ruled by patriots, reverencing character or bent on pleasure, and it would be absurd to deprive Biblical and Church History (not forgetting the history of our own Society) of the broad lessons which they teach.

Fifty years ago, when we were an exclusive people, undenominational schools might have had a much-needed liberalizing influence, but the conditions are different to-day. It has now become necessary, if we would check the serious disaffection of educated young Friends, to provide them with the data upon which to form their opinions in later life. No boy or girl educated in a Friends' School should leave it without having seen how, in the main, sacerdotalism has dimmed the moral vision, and without at least a knowledge of the history and of the broad underlying principles of our Religious Society. We will have nothing to do either with catechism or creed, and we are quite right to leave our scholars free to form their own independent judgment—for nothing else would have any but the most superficial or transient value. But it would be folly to send our young men and women out into the world ignorant even of the historical meaning of their church.

Young people, perhaps especially young men, are keenly sensitive to adverse criticism and ridicule. What chance has a young man sent from a Friends' School to one of the Universities, with their aggressive clerical influence, if to the chaff about the silent meetings he has no explanation to offer, no conception of the spiritual beauty of the ideal it represents? Or if he finds himself in a weak meeting without strong ministry, there is danger, unless he has some intelligent attachment to the essential idea of our worship, that he will become discouraged, and either yield to the seductive influence of the Anglican Church or seek robust ministry elsewhere. We lose too many of our more highly educated young people at this stage, and they will need a stronger grip of the true principles of spiritual life and worship to carry them through it.

In some of our Boarding Schools valuable work has already been done, and their influence has been a powerful factor in stimulating the loyalty of their scholars to the Society. But our whole conception of education is inadequate—it needs broadening, and above all it needs shaping far more definitely to the peculiar needs of a membership upon which the responsibility of a free ministry rests.

It is not enough, as some suppose, to rely alone upon the high moral tone which is rightly held to characterize

a Friends' School. We must recognize that these schools have for the work of the Society, which includes the ministry, something of the same importance which training ships have for a fleet, and, so far as is consistent with general education, they should have a curriculum specially designed to this end.

It is of contributory importance that the whole equipment and general education of our schools, apart from this special feature, should be of the highest possible standard. Our schools should be so good that no Friend need be tempted to send his children elsewhere. If this is not so already it is due more to the lack of funds than to any fault in management. One must suppose that the exceptional importance of these schools as contributing to the spiritual efficiency of our church is not understood, otherwise it is difficult to explain why our wealthy Friends overlook our educational institutions, and allow them to struggle on under a cloud of debt, or with miserably inadequate endowments.

The especial value of denominational education, as already defined, to a small Society like ours, lends also an added importance to the position of the school teachers. Upon their influence much depends, and the church having accepted the responsibility of a free ministry, her future must be largely in their hands. The career and prospects of a Quaker teacher should

then be such as to attract the highest order of mind, and to encourage the most liberal training for the service.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that Friends will be able efficiently to maintain their middle-class schools, especially if they can command the proper endowment which American Friends in their wisdom have been careful to secure. But it may be seriously doubted whether we shall have the strength to provide for those who would in the ordinary course be educated in Board Schools. This, however, will only emphasize the importance of retaining our hold on the class which represents the educated and hereditary stock, whose connection with the past is too valuable to lose.

(2) *The religious training of our young people after school, and of those who are not taught in Friends' Schools.*

If we recognize the great value of our Boarding Schools, it is clearly essential that the religious training of those who are not educated by the Society should have careful attention. But no consecutive training exists: we have some children's classes with more or less scattered teaching, but there is no consecutive development, carefully planned to qualify the young people for the exceptional demands of our church membership.

We need, also, training of a quality and calibre suited to those who have just left a Friends' School, but who have hardly reached the stage when private Biblical study can yield proper sustenance. The want of any arrangement by which the interests of our young people are rightly directed, at a critical period of life, to the support of the meeting for worship, is already disastrous in its consequences and calls for immediate action.

(3) *The religious training of our adult members.*

Already under this head we may chronicle the appearance of the Summer School movement, and note the valuable correspondence class of the Young Friends' Christian Fellowship Union. These are admirable, and such work calls only for encouragement, but inasmuch as they are largely independent of the special attitude and teaching of our Religious Society, there remains an important branch of the work which has hitherto received little attention. We have already noticed in our Society the widespread ignorance as to what constitutes our spiritual heritage. We have called attention to the vagueness of view too often found when a Friend is questioned upon the spiritual position and historical significance of the church to which he belongs. We must supplement the Summer School work by placing within the reach of all our adult members advanced religious teaching similar in aim to that which we have seen to be needful for our children.

This is especially urgent in view of the more frequent admission of new members. The experience of Friends in America should impress us with the importance of this consideration. There is no doubt that where American Friends have drawn in large numbers of outsiders, they have sometimes felt the lack of that controlling and guiding influence which an intelligent understanding of the past necessarily brings. A scheme of lectures on Quaker History, on the Teaching of George Fox, on the Life and Writings of Penn, on the Apology of Barclay, on the Journal of Woolman, or, to come to more modern times, on Elizabeth Fry, on William Allen, on John Greenleaf Whittier, should be worked out, not simply with the view of presenting biographical sketches and interesting historical data, but in order to bring out what we have already called "the practical, spiritual, and non-sacerdotal aspects of divine truth in relation to individual and national life." The isolated addresses on Friends' principles, which are at present our only substitute for more systematic work in this field, are hardly satisfactory, and are certainly insufficient.

We believe a feasible way of meeting, at least in part, the present need, would be to reserve the entire services of a suitable Friend, probably remunerated and controlled through the Summer School Continuation Committee, who would devote part of his time to necessary study,

and the remainder to lecturing in different centres. These lectures would naturally be of a varied character. In some meetings a definite course might be given, in others separate lectures. In small country meetings the magic lantern might be used with effect, and the public might usually be encouraged to attend. The lectures could also be extended to our Adult Schools, for it is along this line, without necessarily sacrificing the undenominational character which they maintain, that the gulf between the Society and the schools is most likely to be bridged.

It will be seen that this suggestion does not conflict with existing Summer School work, but is a development of that already begun. Even the Church of England has found it necessary to adopt like measures, and we can hardly pretend that our standard of intelligence is so high that we can dispense with such education.

Thus far we have endeavoured to indicate some of the directions in which our general conception of equipment for membership in the Society of Friends may be enlarged. We have, in other words, been dwelling upon *the necessity of providing a rich soil from which the ministry may spring*. At present the conditions of our church life are such as to starve the ministry. We do not foster its growth—we neglect the ordinary duties of the husbandman, and complain because the harvest is poor.

But there is another serious consideration. Is the tender plant that springs from this carefully prepared soil to be left to itself? We must accept a further responsibility. There must be means placed within the reach of any Friend who feels the call to the ministry for still further equipment and for closer study.

There should be established a *permanent* Summer School, if one may be permitted thus to stretch the season of sunshine and warmth over the whole of our inclement year. This must not be a Theological College, but a permanent Bible School, open to either sex and to persons of any age. Friends who did not feel themselves called to the ministry would be at liberty to attend, but the curriculum would be aimed mainly at the development of ministerial gifts. Without attempting to detail the scope of study, three main divisions naturally suggest themselves:—

- (1) Biblical Study ;
- (2) General Church History ; and
- (3) Quaker Church History.

These subjects would be handled with the definite intention of giving clearness and force to our spiritual message. The mistake of most theological teaching lies in the fact that truth is conceived as a crystal and not as a seed. To teach general Church History (which,

of course, includes the history of our Society) side by side with its spiritual meaning is to avoid this error, and to set the student in the line of spiritual growth and vision.

The "lay" character of the school would be prominently kept in mind, and facilities would be offered to those whose means were limited, or who had little time to give. Some would attend only to receive sufficient advice and training to set them along lines of fruitful study at home, and much assistance might in this connection be given by correspondence classes. Such a school would necessarily commence on a small scale, and the attendance would at first be very limited, especially for the longer periods of time. But as Friends are gradually brought to recognize what the responsibility of a free ministry involves, they will learn to shape their lives in subordination to it.

Let us remember, for we cannot escape the fact, that our free ministry is now upon its trial. No half measures will solve the problem which faces us. We would repeat that self-sacrifice must be the price of our ideal. Sacrifice of leisure, business sacrifices, sacrifice of money, sacrifice of personal ease and comfort. But while nothing that has been suggested can be undertaken without self-sacrifice, there is nothing to alarm. Spiritual insight remains, as it always must, the mark of the true

minister, and neither the prophetic ministry, which obeys an immediate call, nor that mystic element, which is the quality of a few choice souls, can be imperilled. We seek not to stereotype our worship, nor to tamper with the freedom of spiritual dependence upon God, but to secure such a general condition of church life that spiritual growth shall be fostered, and a high standard of spiritual intelligence shall be maintained. For want of proper nourishment the ideal of the free ministry is perishing before our eyes, and we are but seeking a rich and well-tilled soil from which every type of ministry shall spring with a robuster growth.

It may seem that even this partial solution of the problem is difficult and slow. The drudgery of hard work is evident through it all. But this must be. There is no short and easy way; we must go back to our foundations, and begin again. We must correct the consequences of past mistakes, and for a time, at least, there will be much labour with small reward.

This brings us at the close to that which we have never forgotten. We can do nothing without the patience of a faith that sees clear through apparent discouragement to its goal. We need the vision of the end, the sense of a high and worthy aim to spur us on, and, dependent on a Power greater than our own, we need the humble spirit which asks that it may be ever led by the Master's hand.

Review.

EDWARD GRUBB'S SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE QUAKER FAITH.*

LOOKING back to the opening of the present reign, it seems as though the hope of English politics lay for the moment in the moral fervour of some of the Chartist leaders. Among them were men who upheld the ideals of social duty, of self-sacrifice, and of association, as earnestly as Mazzini himself. It is interesting to recall the formation of the London Working Men's Association (1836) "to create a moral, reflecting, energetic public opinion, so as, eventually, to lead to a gradual improvement in the condition of the working classes, without violence or commotion," in the assurance that "the good that is to be must be begun by ourselves." Although the hostile or suspicious attitude of those in power drove many reformers into the camp of the physical force party, it must never be forgotten that beside the violent, crude, and external theories of reconstruction advanced by many English Socialists of the 'thirties, there ran a strong current of ethical thought and religious conviction. That is true of the latest as well as of the earliest years of this "Victorian Era."

In its cruder and narrower expression Socialism may, perhaps, be regarded as an unwarrantable and even a dangerous form of political dogmatism,—a cut-and-dried scheme of organisation offensive to the Quaker temper of mind. But, on its nobler side, Socialism is the evangelical spirit in politics: it asserts that the industrial and political relations of men must be governed by justice and by love: it seeks to evangelize political theory, and declares the power of the Gospel in national and international life.†

**Headley Brothers, London, 1899. Price 3/6.*

† For this side of Socialism see especially the works of George D. Herron.

To this nobler Socialism Edward Grubb's book is a timely contribution.* Would that the Society of Friends had more of such spiritual teaching as it contains! The fanaticism of some, the indifference of others, and the discouragement so largely prevalent among the more earnest, as they see their fellows enticed by "wandering fires" from the arduous struggle for education and reform, give added value to every wise word. We grow conscious of a pressing demand for some weighty Quaker statement of the true ideals of Church and State, of the importance of associating the practice and study of humanity with that of theology; some statement on the peculiar problems of our cities, on luxurious living, on the ownership and distribution of wealth, and on the dilemma of Socialism and Individualism. An approach to such a statement will be found in the volume before us, and, while some of the essays will be already valued by those who have heard them as lectures, they gain by association. Although this volume is lacking in some of the qualities which give unique value to the writings of John Woolman, and though it may contain little that we can regard as an original and permanent contribution to the solution of economic problems, it is an important effort to express the social aspects of the Quaker faith. In this respect it stands as yet almost alone beside Woolman's "Word of Caution."

The root idea of the higher Socialism is suggested in the first essay, *Christ's Ideal of a Church*. "'Individual faithfulness,' we say, is the one remedy for all our shortcomings. There is more in it than this. The Church is vastly more than the arithmetic sum of its members, just as a living body is far more than a mass of cells. *There is a life of the whole*, in which alone the lives of the individuals find their true meaning, their true development. And it is for the Church, in its corporate capacity, so *to organise this common life that it shall be healthy and vigorous*, not (as it too often is) dwarfed and stunted." There is a common life of the State also, and what is said here of the Church is also true of the State. Individual faithfulness is essential, but it is also necessary that our social and political common life should be wisely

* In the narrower sense the author is no Socialist, but neither is he an Individualist. He recognises that organization and liberty are alike essential.

organised for the health and vigour of the whole body. Organisation and individual responsibility are balanced and inter-related in every phase of life, and are no more antagonistic in political than in religious and philosophical thought where the purpose of the universe still admits of individual choice, and the law of God is still consistent with the free will of man.

But if the Church has "so to organise the common life that it shall be healthy and vigorous," it needs must hold up the ideal of Christ before the world ; it must point out His work among men to-day, and urge that work upon its members. The ideal alone is not enough : we need to recognise the Divine cause. Sixty years ago Joseph Sturge recognised it in the political struggle for manhood suffrage, and gave expression to his belief in the universal illumination of the Spirit on the election hustings at Nottingham.

The teaching and spirit of Jesus leads to social and political deductions, which we may not ignore : it reformed the British constitution in Joseph Sturge's generation, and it need not be politically impotent in ours. It would not be thus impotent if we had a more vital grasp on the truths which we repeat ; not only their clearer intellectual apprehension, important as this is, but that more intimate spiritual possession which alone can reveal their living significance in the crisis of our generation. Theology must be rooted in the consciousness of the indwelling Presence, if it is to be truly applied to the problems of humanity. "The really vital [theological] study for us all is how to live according to the mind of God." Refusing, as we Friends must, to be bound by "the decisions of any human council . . . we need all the more the prophetic word of those who have come in touch with 'the spirit of pure wisdom.'" It is of little use to turn in our need to Yearly Meeting Epistles (p. 105), because our Yearly Meetings have not yet suffered that "agony of shame" which the bond of brotherhood would lay upon them for the squalor and degradation amongst which they sit (*vide* p. 127). And yet "we cannot live the Christian life while we pass these things by. The Evangelicalism that denounces heterodoxy but is always well fed—the strict Quakerism that objects to all pre-arrangement except for making money,—the smooth complacency that detests all zeal except in the search for dividends,—these are the

things that make a Church rotten at the heart. . . It is only by passion that passion can be driven out. The only remedy for the love of self is the love of Christ and of humanity. Wisdom, reasonableness, common-sense, all are vain unless they are inspired by enthusiasm, . . an enthusiasm of devotion to God and to [our] fellows."

Edward Grubb has himself offered us something of that "prophetic word" to which he alludes, more especially in the eighth chapter, *The Teaching of Christ on Wealth*. Having carefully examined the principal sayings of Jesus, he concludes that it "is not money, but the *love* of money; not property, but the spirit that *clings* to property," which Christ rebuked as fatal to His Kingdom,—and argues with much force that this was eventually accepted as His message by the disciples in place of the literal communism at first adopted. Jesus requires the *moralization*, not the *abandonment*, of wealth. He teaches that wealth is a means and not an end,—a trust and not an absolute possession,—and it must be, both in acquisition and use, clear of oppression.

If this be so we must consider the ownership and use of wealth less from the point of view of theoretical "Justice," and more from that of a deepened desire to serve, and a fuller conception of fellowship. This will show us that "we can never rightly assume . . . that the market rate of wages, or rent, or interest, is ordained as a law of God. The good of humanity,—the development of the individual on all sides of his nature,—is the final aim, to which all production of wealth is subordinate; and to the opportunity for this development all have an equal claim. Everyone who receives a share of produce, or its value, is bound to consider the other parties to the joint production, and cannot, as a Christian, rest contented while they are deprived of the means of realizing the best that is in them."

If the doctrine of the Inner Light "which lighteth every man" urged Joseph Sturge to labour for manhood suffrage, is it not now urging Friends to an earnest and tireless effort for "equality of opportunity" in matters which appear as fundamental as the franchise itself, and especially to assure "an ordered and worthy and secure existence to all our fellows"? If our effort be based upon the recognition of the equal spiritual worth of each individual we shall never "overlook or lose the priceless jewel of liberty."

Quaker Education.

Priestliness.

“When there
is no Peace.”

Review.

Special Note.

WE have to apologize for the belated appearance of the October issue of these Papers. In studying the question of Education we have found difficulty in obtaining the necessary figures, and our enquiry has led us so far, and the material accumulated is so considerable, that we feel we cannot deal with the subject in as comprehensive or mature a fashion as we should wish, without deranging the series as proposed in our last number. We propose, therefore, to deal somewhat exhaustively with the subject of Education in the Society of Friends during the coming year. In the meantime we offer a few practical suggestions, bearing particularly on the relation of our boarding schools to our religious society.

Our November issue, dealing with Sunday School Teaching, will follow shortly, and will contain an appreciation of Maeterlinck, by Hugh E. Seebohm.

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles and reviews. All correspondence to be addressed to the Publisher.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

THE RELATION OF FRIENDS' BOARDING SCHOOLS TO THEIR RELIGIOUS SOCIETY.

"Jerusalem was destroyed because the education of the children was neglected."—*The Talmud*.

IN our last essay we considered the problem of our free ministry, and in that connection emphasised the importance of our boarding schools. To this question we now propose to confine ourselves.

At the outset we must acknowledge a fundamental difficulty present in many minds. There are those who object that to advocate the support of Friends' schools is to perpetuate the evils of sectarianism. A narrow policy of exclusive education is held to be inconsistent with the broad catholicism, at once so spiritual and so lofty, which marks the true Quaker. We are reminded that we have neither creed nor catechism, and distinctive religious instruction is viewed with consequent distrust. Some indeed uphold the public or undenominational school

as a temple of the liberal arts, and condemn the Quaker school as a cloister in which the wider interests of life are in part ignored. They claim that a certain *gaucherie* of manner and a sectarian exclusiveness, which seriously limit the influence of Friends, are there contracted.

But what is our policy to be? Must we eliminate the characteristic features of our schools and ultimately abandon them? Or are there special circumstances which warrant their continued existence as distinctive institutions? While we have no sympathy with sectarian exclusiveness, we accept the last alternative, and in the consideration of our schools we propose to discuss (1) their function and (2) future development.

I. As long ago as 1667, George Fox recommended "the setting up of a school at Waltham" for boys, and at Shacklewell for girls, that they might there be instructed "in whatsoever things were civil and useful in the creation." His advice reminds us how mistaken is the supposition that the early Friends deprecated human learning. William Penn, when he sailed for America, left a letter for his wife in which he begged her "not to be sparing of expense in procuring learning for his children; for that by such parsimony all was lost that is saved." Nor does Penn's exhortation lose weight because Fox declared that to be bred at Oxford or

Cambridge is "not sufficient to fit a man to be a minister of Christ." Education is certainly insufficient ; but who will be so rash as to say that education has therefore no part in the preparation of the minister ?

Our Society stands almost alone in maintaining a free ministry, and the grave responsibility of this position presses upon us at every point. We cannot escape it either in our homes or in our schools. For us the educational standard of other religious bodies is inadequate, since we do not set apart certain members for special training in theological colleges. Friends have too jealous a regard for the liberty of the Spirit, and too lively a sense of the danger of its restriction, to fall into the snare of professionalism. But, although the spiritual life is, as Fox discerned, above and beyond all human learning, it requires the highest development of the faculties for its full expression. Can the right development be secured unless our children are educated in schools specially adapted to the requirements of our membership ? We believe not. A high ideal of church fellowship carries with it exacting demands on the individual, and to this end our education must be of special character and quality. In our fellowship all are called to be priests ; and for that high calling our children must be prepared, that they may be able in later life to fulfil the requirements of teachers, ministers

or prophets. This is the one valid and sufficient argument for the continued maintenance of Friends' schools.

The objection that denominational education is petty and one-sided is too often true. But while we wholly disapprove of *such* teaching, we desire that our children may have pointedly placed before them "the practical, spiritual, and non-sacerdotal aspects of divine truth in relation to individual and national life."* Catechism and creed are inadmissible, for religious teaching must not be *ex cathedra*. Our scholars must be free to form their own opinions, for nothing else will have real or permanent value; but this involves the provision of that knowledge upon which their opinions may be formed.

When we consider our small numbers (we represent only '04 per cent. of the population of Great Britain),—the severity of our ideal,—our stern denial of all popular aids to worship,—our steadfast insistence upon the individual exercise of spirit,—we shall recognise that intense personal conviction is the necessary condition of our existence as a church. Those who cherish a high ideal, especially in a time of reaction, must be profoundly impressed with its beauty, its vitality and its purpose

*See Appeal recently issued on behalf of Yorkshire Q.M. Boys' School.

in the world. If our ideal is severe, our children will accept easier and more popular standards unless they have first been instructed in its real significance. This cannot be compassed if they are educated in schools where our ideal is disregarded or denied; for we can not rely solely on the influence of the home when so critical a period of life is spent with the teacher.

II. Even when our schools are properly endowed, properly staffed, and abreast of the best equipment elsewhere, something yet remains. They cannot be simply high-class secular institutions controlled by Friends who exercise a good but indefinable personal influence over pupils of whatever denomination. We do not underrate the valuable work which is already being done, but we believe there is yet room for more definite religious teaching.

It may be objected that this is the work of Sunday schools. But even if our Sunday school teachers could be fairly expected to give the kind of teaching to which we refer, it must be remembered that while many young Friends never attend such an institution at all, they cannot do so while at a boarding school. It is, nevertheless, of the utmost importance that our young people should not leave school without some conception of the broad lessons of religious history, and the governing principles of life indicated particularly in the Bible, and generally in the

history of the human race. They should also have such a conception of the meaning of worship that their loyalty to our Society may stand the test of discouragement and criticism. The disloyalty among educated young Friends, coupled with the haziness of view so often encountered, is evidence that more of such teaching is still required. Its value will lie, as we have before explained, not in dogmatism, but in suggestion. Unquestionably this is delicate work, calling for rare discrimination, no small degree of scholarship, and a special Biblical training, which is not yet available to our teachers.*

The great hindrance in the way of any development of our religious teaching lies in the difficulty of finding time. Yet this teaching is so important that it must be included in the curriculum. We desire our schools to uphold the highest standard of general culture, but they must at the same time so influence their scholars that all the gifts of learning may in after years be turned into the "channel of universal love." On the other hand, we must keep our schools free from the distortion and restriction of the cloister. In the face of these difficulties how are we to proceed? Those who reply should be teachers themselves, and we therefore offer our suggestions with great diffidence.

*We propose to deal with this in our December number.

(1) We would suggest the appropriation of the time usually devoted to the mid-week meeting for worship. Particularly valuable as this meeting may be to many Friends of mature years, boys and girls of school age are apt to look upon its attendance as an unpleasant duty performed under compulsion. This is hardly surprising, for, after all, our children can only come gradually to the condition where our ideal of worship is comprehensible and satisfying. We know of many who have left Friends' schools with a strong distaste for meeting, due on the one hand to compulsory attendance three times a week, and on the other to the frequent neglect of Friends to provide suitable ministry. Could not the time now spent at the mid-week meeting be devoted to a lesson on religious history, neither too elaborate nor too advanced, but having regard to the age of the children present? Church history and the history of our Society might be presented in the light of their development, their lessons deduced, and the application to modern life made plain. The lecture might open with the reading of a passage of scripture and close with a devotional pause.*

*Closely connected with this thought comes that of the condition of the meetings for worship which our schools attend. These should be under the special care of Friends. While we believe that in some degree this is already the case, the need for more suitable and varied ministry is still apparent.

(2) Our second suggestion arises from the consideration of the limited leisure possible to Friends engaged in commercial life. After leaving school they are occupied in learning their business, and the time given to Adult Schools and other practical Christian work necessarily reduces the already brief opportunity for study and meditation. How then can we secure that high standard of religious knowledge which the situation requires?

Our ideal of fellowship is attained only through self-sacrifice. Should not Friends be willing wherever possible to extend the school period, and thus widen the scope of their education without weakening its efficiency? We would suggest a continuation term for special religious teaching and Bible study. The difficulties of such a scheme may of course render it impracticable, but it would, at least, be interesting to try the experiment of a class for the oldest boys and girls in some suitable school. The teacher would need to make a particular study of the subjects handled to qualify himself for this work. The scholars would continue to have the use of the school appointments and accommodation; they would receive more continuous and accurate Bible teaching than the Sunday school could ever afford; and if they were too young to make full and proper use of such teaching at once, they would still have had a grounding, invaluable to them in after years, and which many would otherwise never obtain. Subsequent

individual study would, in some cases, be stimulated, and would be more likely to be fruitful than if such a grounding had never been given.

Whether this particular suggestion is practicable or not, it seems necessary that the foundations of religious training should be carefully laid before our young people take up the full burden of life.

We need the finest minds for such a service, and the Society of Friends will be paving the way to extended usefulness when it so re-organizes its system of education as to attract the best men and women into the ministry of teaching.

PRIESTLINESS.

I AM invited to write on a subject which is very near my heart, and yet I find it difficult to choose a title for my paper. I proposed to call it "On Priestcraft," but on reflection that seems to me to be a relapse into that old bad habit practised by the churches of calling one another hard names, which has been the bane of religious controversy. Perhaps the word which I have now placed at the head of my paper, though of doubtful right to pass as English, will best express my meaning.

I have lately met with a little pamphlet called "The Catholic Sick Room," the object of which is to explain to "Catholics," especially to the poor among them, how they should prepare for the priest when he is coming to visit the death-bed of one of their family. The arrangement of the little table by the bed-side; the flowers which are meant for our Lord; the candles, of which there should be at least two; the glass of water in which the priest is to wash his hands lest any particles of the Sacrament should adhere to them; the disposition of the sick person's limbs so that the

anointing oil may be most easily applied—these and many other details of the same kind are described with a minuteness which is not amusing because it is so deeply pathetic. The author of this pamphlet is an American priest, who once served little mission stations in the Far West, and who is now, I imagine, labouring among the poor of New York or some one of the great Atlantic cities. In reading his little manual I felt that here is a man who is thoroughly sincere. Labouring up the rickety stairs of a squalid lodging-house in New York, and carrying with him the consecrated wafer, he really believes that he is bringing the Lord Himself into the dingy dwelling. He goes, often at the risk of his own life, to fortify the soul of his parishioner for its last long journey; and when he touches the palms of the hands and the soles of the feet of the New York beggar with his holy oil, he feels that he is obeying to the letter the directions of “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ,” given eighteen centuries ago to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad. In all this there is nothing to sneer at, but much to admire, and, Protestants as we are, we can believe with thankfulness that our Lord is often present in these poverty-stricken upper chambers, not indeed in the crucifix or in the pyx, but in the heart of the worshippers who thus with child-like earnestness are calling on His name.

But to believe in the sincerity and to admire the self-devotion of many a Catholic priest is not necessarily to accept the account which he gives of his office, of his relation to Christ, or of his powers over the unseen world. The Apostle Paul also admired, in a certain sense, the earnestness of the Jewish zealots, with whom he was engaged in life-long controversy. "Brethren," he says, "my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." But when it was a question of submitting to the teaching of men, who were only going part way back towards the bondage of Judaism, he did not say "Admirable men, do you Gentiles imitate their zeal for God?" but "O, foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you?"

And even so, in this latter age of the world, after all that has come and gone, it is not only our privilege but our solemn duty to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." With a great price did our fathers obtain for us this freedom. At the martyr's stake, in the felon's cell, in exile from the land which they loved, amid cruel mockings and scourgings, in cheerfully accepted poverty, they bore witness to the truth

that Christ's religion is the religion of free men, not of

"A bondsman shivering at a Jesuit's feet,"

and we, at the close of the nineteenth century, must not let any sentimental back-glances towards the Middle Ages, any weariness of the weight of too much liberty, no, nor even any recoil from the dreary abysses of Materialism and Agnosticism, tempt us back into the bondage out of which they were led by God.

Christianity, true and pure, is, as we believe, the highest manifestation of the religious faculty that the human race has yet witnessed. And because it is the highest it is in a certain sense the simplest. It brings the spirit of man, by the mighty drawing power of the Crucified Saviour, into the presence of his Maker and his Judge. It sets up its own tribunal in the believer's heart, and there, by condemnation, by the arrest of sentence, by most merciful forgiveness, it vindicates the law and makes it honourable; it transforms the life of man, it moulds and re-models conduct, it produces a real Imitation of Christ: if it might but work unchecked it would transfigure and glorify the world, and would almost turn the wonderful prophetic pictures of Isaiah into reality.

But just because Christianity is so high and so pure, the soul of man has ever and anon shrunk away from its penetrating glance. Like the children of Israel at

the foot of Sinai, the second and third generation of Christians, and most of the succeeding generations in their turn, have looked round for someone to whom they could say "Speak thou with us and we will hear; but let not God speak with us lest we die." When the worshipper is in this mood of mind then comes the priest's opportunity. First a man here and there, then an order of men, then a mighty hierarchy arises which says only too eagerly "We will answer for your sins, we will tell you how to purge your consciences, we will be to you instead of God," and in an undertone, "Give us lands and wealth and lordship, and deck us with mitres and capes and albs and chasubles. We will offer you the sacrifice of the Mass, standing between you and God, and you shall look on and your consciences shall have peace."

A trifling anecdote may sometimes indicate the practical working of a principle better than a long dissertation. Some years ago a number of gentlemen were engaged in preparing evidence in support of a certain measure which was to be brought before Parliament. It was a very busy Session: time pressed, and they had worked late on through the Saturday night and into the Sunday morning. One of the number suggested that it was time to go to bed if they wished to go to their several places of worship next morning. "All right," said another, who was a recent convert to

the Roman Catholic Church, "leave it with me and I will work on for some hours yet. I shall know that those fellows yonder (pointing to a neighbouring Oratory) are doing my worship for me." Now this gentleman was a man of culture, one who had thought much on religious subjects,—a choice specimen of "the Oxford movement"; but there spoke, as I venture to think, the spirit which goes back into bondage, away from the freedom and away also from the responsibility of faith. Trust this spirit fully, give up your consciences to its control, and it will lead you back through confession and indulgences into the romantic darkness of the Middle Ages, and through that into a state of mind as alien to the free Spirit of Christ as the fetichism of Ashantee or the praying-mills of Tibet.

I would invite the timid souls who are overawed by the pretensions of the priest, whether Anglican, Greek, or Roman, to take a broad and far-reaching view of this question. It is easy, if one limits one's scrutiny to one small and narrow issue, to bewilder oneself as to the true intent and meaning of God's revelation of Himself in the face of Jesus Christ. The man who is perpetually pondering the text, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church" (forgetful of the passages providentially preserved which shew what blunders Peter himself made, and how far from infallible he was), may get into as dazed and helpless a condition as the

man who is always studying "unfulfilled prophecy," and who dare hardly save his seed lest the end of the world should come before next year's harvest.

But taking a broad and comprehensive, yet reverent, view of God's dealings in the religious education of the human race, and recognizing that even towards the heathen populations of the world He left not Himself without witness, let us ask ourselves "Is it probable that this priest, with his material appliances for the saving of our souls, with his professed power to lengthen or shorten the stay of our beloved ones in purgatory according to the number of coins which is placed in his hand, is or is not the final outcome of God's education of the being whom He formed in His own image?"

Whether we call the process development, or progressive revelation, or the education of the world, everyone who has not fallen into the gulf of pessimism believes that there has been through the ages some upward tendency of the human race; and he who believes in God believes that this progress has been made *haud sine numine* by the help of the Divine and Teaching Spirit.

Ponder over the evidence of this progress in the Hebrew Scriptures. See how the conception of the spiritual nature of the Most High grows and strengthens, how the merely national God expands into the All-father, who says, "Blessed be Egypt, My people, and Assyria,

the work of My hands, and Israel, Mine inheritance (Isaiah xix. 25). See how Israel is led up through all the cumbersome sacrifices of the law to the great discovery, "He hath shewed thee, oh man, what is good, and what doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" And then ask thyself, "Is it likely that all this long and glorious upward progress from the material to the spiritual, from the ceremonial to the moral, from that which dazzles the senses to that which touches the heart and moulds the character, was meant to end in the genuflections and the posturings, the dressings and undressings, the swinging of censers and tinkling of bells, which make up the sacrifice of the Mass?" Very beautiful sometimes it may be as a piece of religious opera, though perhaps the worship of the Virgin goddess in the Parthenon of Athens would have more completely satisfied the artistic instinct. But that is not the question. You, oh Priest! who claim to stand between us and God while you perform "the sacrifice of the Mass," do so only in the name of Jesus Christ, and will at once confess that without His authority you are nowhere. In the words of His Apostle Peter we say "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear?" And in the words of Jesus Christ Himself, our great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, we say, "God is a

Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Far be it from us to deny that many do thus worship Him—reaching through the enwrappings of ceremony to the eternal and spiritual substance,—but we say that our spirits are not helped but hindered by all the posturings of the priest. We do not believe all this religious pageantry to be in accordance with the Mind of Christ, and we are determined to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

THOMAS HODGKIN.

“WHEN THERE IS NO PEACE.”

VAINLY they plead for peace whose deeds all day
Are working violence ; vainly they pray
Who cherish the tempestuous treachery
Of covetous desire,—whose hearts agree
To no divine surrender, aye accurst
With fever's fierce insatiable thirst ;
Vainly they pray for peace whose passions are
The insolent imperatives of war,—
Whose pride is urgent at the gates of Hell,
Until across the world the mocking yell
Of battle answers them upon their knees
With its irrevocable blasphemies ;
They only pray for peace whose lives prepare
The everlasting kingdom of their prayer.

HENRY BRYAN BINNS.

ROBERTSON'S CHRISTIAN MINISTER.*

WITH the question of the ministry so much before us as it is just now, this volume may be of special interest to Friends, and all the more so as coming from a point of view so different from our own. The lectures are addressed to theological students intending to enter the ministry and make it their life work, and, in most cases, their livelihood. They are to be ministers set apart, appointed to definite work, and to occupy a unique position in the congregation to which they are attached. This is understood at the outset, and we need not stop to comment on it, more than to say, as we glance ahead at the duties involved in the profession, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

When we come, however, to look in detail at each of the duties or spheres of influence assigned to the minister, we have to acknowledge that they are duties that spring naturally from the needs of every congregation. Our author does not hold any sacerdotal views as to the priesthood, he only thinks of men and women and their inevitable spiritual necessities.

The first subject to be treated is the minister's *aim* in all his work, and this is defined to be "the development of Christ-like character" in his congregation. Then come the chief points of Christian doctrine or thought which will be found most efficacious in producing the desired effect upon character. We may or may not agree with the writer in this section of his subject, or, at any rate, in his expression of the thought he deems so important, but, in any case, it need not influence our receptiveness to the rest of his work, in which he deals with the practical means to be adopted to bring home the desired spiritual truth to any given body of people.

* *The Christian Minister: His Aims and Methods.* Lectures on Pastoral Theology at the four Scottish Universities, by James Robertson, D.D. 1899, London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier. Price 3/6.

There is, first, "The sermon, and the work on it," and a most interesting and suggestive chapter it is which deals with this subject. The sermon, as our author understands it, is no set discourse written and delivered by the minister at a certain time to one congregation, but which, for all it contains, might just as well have been written by someone else for quite a different set of people. It is that small portion of divine truth of which the minister has had "direct vision," and which he feels is specially adapted to the needs of his congregation at that particular time.

And with what care he is to endeavour to present this truth so that it may take hold of his hearers! No intellectual slovenliness must be allowed to confuse the clearness of expression, and the best thought of others and the best experience of life must be brought into requisition to illustrate and make good the points. Whether it is to be read or spoken, the sermon must be written out: "No sermon should ever be preached of which the outline and argument could not be written down, easily, distinctly, shortly." What a test is this, and yet what a reasonable one!

Passing now to the second division of the subject, the adaptation of the sermon to the mind and heart of the hearers, he says: "When sermons of good men fail, it is, in the immense majority of cases, from want of adaptation. . . I would urge upon you that want of adaptation to your hearers is not only unskilful, and the cause of most failures in preaching, but that it is really a moral fault, arising, as it does, from indolence, deference to custom, preoccupation with one's own ideas, and want of that knowledge of our people and sympathy with them, which is their due." This "sympathy," just alluded to, involves adaptation not only of the *matter* of the sermon, but the language of it, to the understanding of those who are to hear. This does not mean any condescension, or lowering of the literary standard, even when the congregation is entirely unlearned; it means instead the most careful choice of words, each word to carry the weight intended and to hit the mark. On this subject of careful use of means to ends, Dr. Robertson quotes Mr. Gladstone, who says: "This we are all agreed on, that there cannot be too much preparation, if it be of the right kind. No doubt it is the preparation of matter; it is the accumulation and thorough digestion of knowledge; it is the forgetfulness of personal and selfish motives; it is the careful consideration of method; it is that a man shall make himself as a man suited to speak to men, rather than that he should make himself as a machine ready

to deliver to men preconceived words. It is only out of the full heart, and likewise out of the well-furnished mind, that good extemporaneous preaching can proceed."

Turning now from the sermon to the other duties of the minister, Dr. Robertson deals next with "Public Worship," and it is interesting here to note his strong advice to his students not to relinquish extempore "free prayer" for written or read prayers: "I pray you have in remembrance St. Jude's description of Christian prayer—'Praying in the Holy Ghost.' This may, indeed, be obtained in liturgical fixed prayer; but I venture to say it is most naturally and completely realized in free prayer, when a man prays as is suggested by the believing sense of having now for himself, and for the congregation, access to the Father, through Jesus Christ, in the Spirit. It is this kind of prayer in which the heart is most really and consciously opened to God, in which the great privilege of communion with God is most directly used and enjoyed in which the man himself most feels, and those with him most feel, that he is really speaking to God. And it is this kind of prayer which has the most effect in spreading through a congregation the awe and joy of the Divine presence, and of drawing the hearts of the people upwards by spiritual contagion."

As Friends, we cannot help applying these remarks to the question of the sermon as well as the prayers, and to the other parts of "Public Worship," but that point need not delay us here.

An interesting chapter is devoted to "Visiting,"—interesting, not so much, perhaps, from any special hints for this difficult duty, but as showing the standard entertained by a minister who has the real welfare of his flock at heart. In every house and every family he should be a welcome guest, and should know how to strike the golden mean in his intercourse between "being the minister always" and being such that the people would say "we should not have known that he was a minister."

In trouble or illness he must be always ready and esteem it a high privilege to be "looked to, to be expected, to be welcome in the solemn crises of life, and that people who can hardly see anyone will usually see their minister."

Another duty of the minister is the preparation of the young people for communion. With each of these he should aim to have

a private conversation, not such as to embarrass any sensitive or reserved spirit, but in which the minister should get them, if possible, to open their hearts to him freely and tell him something of their thoughts and difficulties. This is Dr. Robertson's injunction to his hearers: "I pray you resolve that none shall pass through your hands at this stage without knowing for the rest of their lives that Christian faith and Christian life are realities, and knowing what these realities are."

It will be seen, I think, from what has been already quoted, that a beautiful picture is drawn in these lectures of the "Christian Minister" among his people, and a picture of the important points of which we cannot ignore the bearing for our own congregations. The Christian minister, as portrayed here, has not, as I said before, invented duties for himself; his aims, at any rate, are what we must all sympathize with; the only question is of the methods for attaining them.

If our principles are sound, and if our practice is justifiable, we, as a Christian Church, should be able to accomplish all he aims at in our own way. We should have ministers whose sermons are as forcible and as lucid as he describes, but with spontaneity added; the members of our meetings should not lack for Christian sympathy and advice in their private difficulties and troubles, and the young people should not suffer for want of loving interest and spiritual teaching.

Our reason for not appointing ministers to undertake this work is because we believe that the right ministers to do it ought to be Divinely appointed, and that in a true church such ministers will be forthcoming.

None the less, it may be well for us occasionally to look outside our own walls to see what our fellow-Christians consider to be the standard and requirements of the ministry, so that our own consciences, at any rate, may be stimulated; and if we are not willing to acquiesce in a special setting aside of a certain number of our members for the work of the ministry, and their special preparation for it as a life-work, we may, at least as individuals, think more closely what part of the whole work of the ministry it is for us to fulfil, and be ready to carry out the simpler, but very solemn, injunction to "Prepare thyself."

CATHARINE M. ALBRIGHT.

The Prophets'
Nursery.

“Apostate.”

Review.

The Editor, J. Wilhelm Rowntree, has removed to "Silverdale," Scalby, R.S.O., Yorkshire, and all correspondence relative to the contents of the *Present Day Papers* should now be addressed to him there.

All subscriptions and other communications should still be sent to Henry B. Binns, Acomb, near York.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

THE PROPHETS' NURSERY.

"I do verily believe that if parents did their duty as they ought the word publicly preached would not be the ordinary means of regeneration in the church, but only without the church, among practical heathen and infidels."—*Richard Baxter*.

TO-DAY the prophet finds his old ground of denunciation in the unspiritual view of wealth and empire which prevails and is still sanctioned by the churches. We are ever pulling down our barns to build greater, until we, as a nation, stand in peril of that ignoble satisfaction with material prosperity which beset the rich man in the parable. And when our soul is required of us—when we must answer the challenge of some great crisis—what avails our material wealth or our popular education, unless we be also rich in the things of God?

Such thoughts naturally arise when we see England swept by the "red fool fury" of war,—when we hear a barbaric Press voicing the criminal passions of "enlightened democracy." The travesties of patriotism and reform which satisfy us in the present crisis, lay bare to view the deficiency of our moral education.

"Train up a child in the way he should go,
And even when he is old he will not depart from it,"

says a Hebrew proverb generally accepted as truth. But if it be true, it convicts our popular education of failure in the main object of training. For what, after all, is education?

"To teach us what to love and what to hate, whom to honour and whom to despise, is the substance of all human training, and this is not to be learned from the magnet or the microscope, from insects born in galvanism and light polarized in crystals, but only from the affairs of men; from the rich records of the past, the strife of heroic and the peace of saintly souls, from the great thoughts of great minds and the sublime acts of indomitable conscience. . . . Scientific culture is morally neutral, simply enlarging the range without altering the quality of the character."

Thus Dr. Martineau, and thus every prophet. There can be no moral value in education unless it be based on the records of the revelation of God in Christ, vouchsafed to His saints, and expressed in their lives. Great is our need for the culture of the soul. This

“wonderful century” of material development is marked by no corresponding increase in the passion for holiness. Morality has not kept pace with prosperity. The narrower conceptions of religious truth have yielded more often to the insidious assault of pleasure than to the enlargement of a clearer faith. There appears a growing materialist tendency towards a worship of pleasure and success rather than of honour and honesty.

Under these conditions, thoughtful observers view the spread of prosperity, education, and political power, among an ever increasing proportion of the community, with grave concern. Not that they wish to restrict these privileges to the few, but that they recognise the demoralising influence of all neglected opportunity. Liberty, equality and fraternity have proved little more than a fatal mockery where the liberty of the Spirit, the equality of the Sons of God, and the fraternity of the Saints has been denied.

The essentials of a wholesome and healthy national life are not to be attained by any people which neglects the proper use of its Sabbath, and leaves the fellowship of its churches and its meetings for worship to women and children. The nation which closes its Bible closes its book of life. But there is a concensus of opinion among those who have a right to speak that we have taught our children to read not the Bible but the newspaper.

In spite of increasing education our men and women are growing up largely ignorant of the spiritual significance of the book of books. Even the Scotch artisan forgets to take it from its shelf. And the people who are losing their Bible are lapsing from the fellowship of the churches. Denominationalism has seemed inconsistent with that toleration which is born of prosperity; but are we sure that the fundamental idea of church-fellowship is not perishing with denominationalism? Do we confound toleration with compromise? Freedom from dogmatism and from a persecuting spirit is but of negative value unless it springs from fineness of vision and purity of zeal. Friends, by their uncompromising protests in the steeple-houses and prisons of the Commonwealth and Restoration, established their right to freedom and to the catholic view of religion which they hold.

Church-fellowship, or denominational kinship, is one of those blessings of religious life strangely undervalued at the present time. With the growth of the idea of brotherhood and association, it would be sad indeed to see the dissolution of those societies which are founded upon a common conception of the hope and work of the Christian. The weakening of the bond of fellowship follows naturally on vagueness of belief. When the basis of association is uncertain the life of the Church is gone.

It is somewhat extraordinary that this loss of church and Bible should be largely coincident with the development of the Sunday School. Churchmen of various denominations have publicly acknowledged that while the majority of English children are in their Sunday Schools, only a small proportion become church members or even intelligent Bible readers. If this be true a serious failure in the method of the religious instruction must be recognised. The future of England is in the hands of the Sunday School teachers as never before, for the proportion of children under their care is steadily increasing. There is no mission-field in which a greater harvest can be reaped than that in which our Sunday teachers labour. They are the ministers of the children's church.

While recognising that the spiritual condition of England cannot be estimated in figures, let us try to understand the statistical side of this strange situation. We will take first the actual proportion of Sunday scholars in England and Wales. The population in 1898 was officially estimated at 31,397,078, twenty-five per cent. of these, or approximately 7,850,000, were of Sunday School age, that is, from, say, four to fourteen years old (inclusive). In 1898 the report of the number of scholars in the English and Welsh Sunday Schools submitted to the World's Third Sunday School Convention places it at 6,843,072, or twenty-two per cent. of the total population.

If we accepted this figure, it would appear that nine children out of ten are on the English and Welsh Sunday School rolls. But we suspect that this estimate is excessive. Even if it should prove, however, that only some six million children are in our Sunday Schools, that still means three children out of four,—a very large proportion, especially when we remember that Sunday Schools are principally intended for the children of “working people.”

The Sunday School movement, as is well known, originated at Gloucester in 1780, when Robert Raikes, touched by the heathen condition of the poorer children, opened his first school in that city. In 1818, four per cent. of the population were Sunday scholars; in 1833, nearly eleven per cent.; in 1851, 13·5 per cent. No Government returns have been made since that date, and the figures furnished by the Sunday School Union must be accepted with reserve. At the present time the number probably amounts to 18·5 per cent. We have not been able to check the whole of the figures comprised in this total, but the unchecked figures are small, and, therefore, the margin of possible error must be insignificant. A careful estimate of the actual number of Sunday scholars connected with the Protestant Churches of England and Wales, based on the statistics

we have been able to obtain before going to press, is as follows :—

Church of England (<i>a</i>)	...	...	...	2,458,500
Wesleyan Methodists (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	961,000
Congregationalists (<i>a</i>)	...	...	...	684,000
Baptists (<i>c</i>)	...	...	...	490,000
Primitive Methodists (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	465,000
Calvinistic Methodists (<i>c</i>)	...	...	...	202,000
Methodist Free Church (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	201,500
Methodist New Connexion (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	84,400
Presbyterians (<i>c</i>)	...	...	...	82,000
Bible Christians (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	57,000
Independent Methodists (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	26,000
Wesleyan Reform Union (<i>b</i>)	...	...	...	20,300
Unitarians (<i>a</i>)	...	...	...	34,500
Friends (<i>d</i>)	...	...	...	14,400
Lady Huntingdon's Connection (<i>c</i>)	...	...	...	3,000
Free Church of England (<i>c</i>)	...	...	...	3,000
Other minor sects (<i>e</i>)	...	...	...	12,000
Ragged and Mission Schools, undenominational (33,000) (<i>e</i>)	...	...	...	
Total				5,798,600

It would be interesting to know how many of these children enter the churches, but it is impossible to give

-
- (*a*) Estimate based on Official Year Book, 1899.
 - (*b*) Figures kindly supplied by Secretary Wesleyan Methodist S.S. Union.
 - (*c*) Estimate based on H. Evans' "Free Churches in Victorian Era."
 - (*d*) Actual figures of last Annual Report.
 - (*e*) Rough estimate based on F. J. Hartley's figures in "S.S. Army," 1889.

any satisfactory statement of the annual increase in church membership. We give the following figures as a purely tentative suggestion, and without any claim to precise accuracy.

Annual Increase in Church Membership :

1. Church of England (communicants), average for seven years	73,000
2. Wesleyan Methodists (Society Members and Members on trial), average for eleven years, say	2,500
3. Primitive Methodists, average for eleven years, say	500
4. Other Protestant Denominations (at rate of increase corresponding to that of Nos. 2 and 3)	5,500
Total	81,500

The proportion of children fourteen years of age is given in the census returns as one-twelfth of the total number of those between four and fourteen (inclusive) : calculating on this basis, about half-a-million children must be leaving the Sunday Schools every year. We find, therefore, that on this estimate only one-sixth of these Sunday scholars become even nominal members of their respective churches. But if the Wesleyan Methodist Church is taken as a particular example representing the largest of the Free Protestant Churches of England and Wales, the percentage, actual and not estimated, is more striking.

	1889.		1899.	Increase in ten years.
Society Members ...	420,982	...	446,577	
Members on Trial	33,920	...	32,905	
	<u>454,902</u>		<u>479,482</u>	<u>24,580</u>
Average annual increase	...	...	...	2,458
Average number Sunday School Scholars, 1889 and 1899 ...	...	...	...	940,500
Number leaving Sunday School every year, say				78,000
Percentage who become Society members, three per cent. (In the Church of England nearly thirty-six per cent. appear to become communicants.)				

“The masses have been inside the Sunday Schools, they are to-day outside the churches.” So writes C. Silvester Horne: and this anomaly has startled the statesmen of the churches into some notable utterances on the causes of failure. In 1896 Prof. Adeney contributed three valuable articles to *The Christian World*, and in August last Dr. Clifford delivered an eloquent presidential address on this subject to the British Chautauqua.* These articles put the position, at which we had independently arrived, with so much force that we shall venture on free quotation.

To Professor Adeney's mind the reform of our Sunday Schools has “more practical urgency than any other of the

* *Vide Christian World*, Jan. 30th, Feb. 6th and 13th, 1896, and *Christian World Pulpit*, Aug. 16th, 1899.

II. In the choice of subjects we want more system, honesty, and proportion. It is not necessary to follow the line of historical development in the children's class, but the subjects must be arranged in the order best suited to the growth of the child's own mind. It is absurd to teach a child the more difficult parts of Christian truth. The aim of Sunday School teaching is the natural development of the religious sense.

"Our first aim should be to assist the healthy growth of mind and soul. . . . I dread nothing so much as pedantry in Sunday School teaching. The most ill-informed but warmly sympathetic methods would be better than that. Still we want to set before the teachers a definite purpose, and . . . it seems to me that purpose should inspire a scheme designed to lead on through a child's first responsive affection for Jesus Christ, to an intelligent grasp of Christian truth, and the large shaping of Christian character in the mould of a strong manhood and womanhood."

Often the treatment of the subject may be admirable while the subject itself is wholly unsuitable. But we also need stricter honesty in our lessons.

"Half the teaching of the Sunday School is obsolete everywhere but in the Sunday School. . . . What the minister would shudder to preach in the church, the teachers are continually inculcating in the school. We have two theologies running side by side in most of our congregations, that of the Sunday School being at least fifty years behind that of the pulpit."

This false conservatism is highly dangerous. "Most of the vulgar objections to the truth of Christianity which stagger the faith of young disciples would fall

to the ground innocuous, if they did not appeal to notions which no educated theologian any longer maintains." Why should we allow our children to be taught what we do not ourselves believe?

In teaching from the Old Testament there must be a frank recognition on the part of the teacher that much is wholly unsuitable for a children's class. "Let Genesis with its strange problems, and other books similarly characterised, wait for the mature years when they can be wisely handled. I would have the lessons for children only touch topics that invite an unreserved—a perfectly enthusiastic treatment." *

* Professor W. T. Davison, of Handsworth College, speaking at the World's Third Sunday School Convention, said :—"The Bible requires to be studied like any other book, with all our reasoning powers. This brings us to the much discussed subject of modern Biblical criticism: What has the Sunday School teacher to do with it? Speaking generally, I think, very little; but every teacher may understand what is meant by it—learn not to be afraid of it, leave the work itself to those whom it may concern, and then acquaint himself with the best results of the science when these are fairly and firmly established. Criticism means inquiry and judgment; Biblical criticism means investigation into the books of the Bible on their literary side, inquiring as to the text, date, authorship, contents and composition of the books, and forming a judgment according to the best light available. No Christian, at least no Protestant, should be afraid of such inquiry, even if from time to time it should be found needful to modify opinions held concerning some books, their date, structure or meaning. But not in one case in ten thousand is it desirable to discuss these questions in class."

But we need the sense of proportion almost as much as that of honesty. The central theme of all our teaching must be the story and the truth of Jesus. Measurements of the tabernacle, details of the Jewish sacrifices, the distinction between beasts clean and unclean—these antiquarian matters have little indeed to do with the religious instruction of the young. The lives of those who have been filled with the spirit of religion are surely more worthy of study than the mere archæology of the Bible—even than some of the Bible narratives themselves. How much more valuable in this respect are the annals of Robert and Mary Moffat, or the story of St. Francis, than some of the awful tales in Judges!

III. In considering the relation between the church and the school, Professor Adeney dwells on the difficulties inherent in the modern idea of undenominational Sunday Schools. Children, growing up in them without any natural definite attachment to any particular church, drift at last into that by law established, which alone presses its ecclesiastical ideas on all whom it can reach with the "passion of a propaganda." The place of undenominational teaching is the elementary, not the Sunday School. We want no subtle Jesuitry, but we want the Sunday School to be avowedly the church-porch, "instead of allowing it to remain any longer

as a mere appendage." The denominationalism here proposed is not of course the jangling of the sects, but "purely positive teaching which shall directly aim at leading the scholars into lifelong association with the church, of which the school lays itself out to be the recruiting ground." The work of the Sunday School is the home-work of the church, and its first object must be to provide suitable diet for the nurture of its own family.

Dr. Clifford has some strong words on this subject :

"Nothing is more pathetic in our condition to-day than the increasing drift from church life and membership. It is certain that the churches are not training young England for the worship and work of the Christian Society. . . . Absence from worship tends to empty the heart of the admiration, hope and love by which, according to Wordsworth, we live ; and casts out of the mind the ideas of God, and of the sovereignty of duty, and of the deeper meanings of life."

In truth, the Sunday School is, or should be, the children's church : and this view of the school reminds us that the teacher, no less than the public preacher, is a minister in his religious society.

- After this brief survey of Sunday Schools in general, what shall we say of those in our own Society? If we exclude all Adult Schools, with their junior branches and children's classes, as being outside the scope of this paper, we shall find that little is left.

Enquiries were made in twenty of our larger meetings, in thirteen of which there was no Quaker Sunday School of the kind to which we refer. These thirteen meetings represent one-sixth of our membership.

Meeting.	Members.	Attenders.	Remarks.
Bradford	215	191	Some members' children attend Adult School Children's Class.
Brighton	201	38	A separate children's meeting for worship once a month.
Chelmsford	186	9	None.
Croydon	269	46	Conducted for twenty-five years, but recently given up.
Hull... ..	104	24	None.
Liverpool... ..	273	53	Abandoned. Some attend Adult School Class.
Manchester	409	92	None.
Newcastle	290	85	Children's class associated with Adult School. International Sunday School Lesson Sheets used.
Norwich	109	54	School for members' and attenders' children commenced fifteen years ago. Now two-thirds or more are not Friends. The children of members and attenders meet for first half of morning meeting for separate worship.
Reading	178	45	Sunday School commenced 1868, before Adult School. There is, however, no definite Quaker teaching, and the majority of the children are non-Friends. The International Sunday School Sheet is used.
Sheffield	278	103	None.
Stoke Newington	308	33	Few children of Sunday School age. Class is not confined to Friends, and there is no definite Quaker teaching.
Southport... ..	137	11	Abandoned after a short trial.
Total	2,957	784	

From four meetings we have affirmative replies to the question "Have you any Sunday School for the children of members and attenders (as distinct from one only intended for the children of Adult Scholars)?" But any scheme of consecutive Quaker teaching is rare.*

Meeting.	Members.	Attenders.	When commenced.	Number of Scholars.	Number of Teachers.	Age of Scholars.	Remarks.
Birmingham	664	187	1870	16	2	7-15	There have been three classes in this meeting, but one of these (for older children) was given up in 1888, while another has just been discontinued. In 1889 there were fifty-two children in attendance. Definite Friends' teaching is given, and sometimes the lessons are consecutive.
Reigate ... (Redhill)	109	14	1892	26	2	4-12	Allusion to Friends' views when suitable. Short courses given from time to time; e.g., "Parables," "Miracles," "Life of Paul," "Life of Joseph," "The Twelve," "Animals and Flowers of the Bible," etc.
Scarborough	109	60	1897	30	4	4-14	Lessons chosen by Teachers. Not specially "Quaker" in character.
York... ..	361	121	1874	58	—	4-15	No connected plan of lessons. Some forty Friends drawn upon to teach. Every other Sunday is a <i>Children's Meeting</i> rather than a class—children are brought into meeting for last half-hour. Allusion to Friends' views when suitable. Tends to draw children closer to the meeting.
Total ...	1243	382					

This does not, of course, represent the whole situation. The statistics are incomplete. In some small meetings good work is doubtless being done.

* Affirmative replies have been received from Bristol and Leeds, too late to tabulate.

At Settle, for instance, a class for the children of members and attenders was commenced about twenty years ago. Very valuable work was done in explaining the leading principles of Friends, and encouraging the children in various forms of practical service. Twelve of the children were born members, and remain such. Six applied for membership; of these, the five survivors share in the active work of Friends. Six or seven have become teachers in the class.

The evidence before us sufficiently reveals the fact that the Sunday School fills only a small place in our church fellowship. But, if the proportion of children in the Society of Friends were equal to that in the country at large, we should have some 4,250. This figure, however, is certainly too high. The birth-rate amongst Friends is known to be lower than that of the general population, while the children of a large number of Friends are not registered as members of the Society. From J. S. Rowntree's figures (to which further reference is made on p. 22), it appears that the names of some 210 children are added to our list of members every year; if this is correct, it may not be unfair to suppose that there are nearly 2,000 members of Sunday School age (*i.e.*, from four to fourteen years old inclusive). But we must not forget the large and increasing number of children associated with us who are excluded from our

membership because one of their parents is not a Friend. J. S. Rowntree considers that they largely outnumber those in membership. Thus, roughly speaking, there must be from 4,000 to 5,000 children who might be expected to use our Sunday Schools.* To provide instruction for so large a number presents a difficult problem. In the English and Welsh Sunday Schools there is one teacher to ten scholars; and even if we suppose our teachers able to handle twice as many children, we should still require 250 Sunday School teachers, while there are already 800 classes in our Adult Schools, and of the 1,200 teachers engaged in the children's schools connected with them, a large number must be Friends.

In the face of this difficulty are we to fall back, as in the past, on family training? Probably the limited

* Taking two northern meetings as a basis for checking this estimate, we find that there are 470 members, and 60 children of "Sunday School age"; and 181 attenders with 63 children, making 123 children in all. If the same rate prevailed over the country we should have 2,100 members' children, and about 2,600 children of attenders, or 4,700 children in all, whose ages range from four to fourteen years.

development of our Sunday Schools is largely due to the confidence Friends have long been accustomed to repose in the influence of the Quaker home. The ideal Quaker home has been, and must always remain, the cradle of the Church. But we incline seriously to doubt whether this influence is so general in our Church as it once undoubtedly was. During the last fifty years social changes have been swift, and we have hardly yet measured their consequences. The restriction of activities and interests, enforced partly by law and partly by tradition, so characteristic of Quaker life in the early part of this century, set a pronounced emphasis upon church affairs, and tightened the social bonds of a community thus thrown back upon itself. But those restrictions have gone, and new and complex influences, born of our strenuous modern life, have swept in upon us. Rapid changes, witnessed during the course of a single generation, have brought with them problems which we are called upon to solve. The conditions which now govern our church-life compel us to recognise our increased responsibility for the religious training of the young. Let us illustrate this point:—In *The Friend*, of June 30th last, J. S. Rowntree* presented a statistical statement, compiled from the annual returns, as follows:—

* In an article on "The Relation of the Society of Friends to the children of its members."

Periods of Five Years.	Average No. of Births reported to Yearly Meeting.	Admissions as Minors.	Total Admissions of Children.	Admissions of Adults on Application.
1861-65	269	38	307	91
1866-70	266	49	315	133
1871-75	241	53	294	140
1876-80	215	71	286	195
1881-85	184	51	235	222
1886-90	172	46	215	259
1891-95	158	57	215	266
Three Years :				
1896-98	150	60	210	315

These figures show that the number of children now entering the Society is small and constantly diminishing. The writer of the article says: "In 1800, with a membership of about 19,800, nearly 500 children (486) became members annually ; in 1898, with a membership of 17,031, the number had fallen to 150, or 210 if we add those admitted on the application of their parents. . . . If the figures are to be depended on, it appears as if the number of children entering the Society now was only about one-third of what it was in 1800."*

* J. S. Rowntree suspects that the number of births reported is not complete, owing to the effect of the national registration which began in 1837.

Among the conclusions drawn are these:—

(1) That the accessions to our membership are less and less dependent on the admission of children through birth.

(2) That the number of Friends' children not in membership is now probably much larger than that of those in membership.*

(3) *That the connection of the Society with the children of its members is less close than it formerly was.* Following this paper there appeared, in the same journal, three thoughtful articles by W. H. F. Alexander,† in which the significance of these figures as bearing upon the question of birthright membership was rightly emphasised. While a discussion of that question would be out of place here, we would suggest that, if any reform in the condition

* This conclusion is supported, among other evidence, by the accompanying remarkable table of Friends' marriages.

Date.	Average No. of Marriages by Friends' Ceremonials.	Percentage in which both Parties were Members.	Percentage in which one Party was a Member.	Average No. of Friends married by other Ceremonials.
1861-65	57	84%	14%	0
1896-98	100	42%	40%	57

† *Vide Friend*, Oct. 20th, 27th, Nov. 3rd, 1899.

of church membership is advocated, Friends go further and consider the practical measures which the increase in our responsibility as a church will involve. Unless we are willing to undertake the religious education of the children who will come under our care, it appears to us that the question of birthright membership had better not be raised.

In view of these figures and quite apart from the question of birthright membership, one fact seems clear, viz., that with so large a non-Quaker element we cannot rely exclusively upon private religious training in the home.

Judging by the enquiries we have made, there is a tendency to merge the Sunday School in the Adult School Children's Class. But is it reasonable to expect that children will naturally become active Friends if this be the most definite teaching they receive? The meeting for worship cannot fairly be expected to provide the instruction which the Sunday School is designed to give. Amid all the attractions and distractions of modern life, can we afford to dispense with the Quaker Sunday School?

It may indeed be questioned whether we have kept before us the necessity for definite religious teaching for our young people, and at a time when the question of birthright membership is being widely discussed we may fitly consider whether a more efficient and comprehensive exercise of our responsibility is not possible.

We cannot in this paper cover the whole ground, but we venture upon a few suggestions in the hope that they may lead discussion into practical channels.

I. *The establishment of Sunday Schools.*

Should we not aim at the establishment of a Friends' Sunday School in every meeting?

It is sufficiently serious that so small a number of Friends are directly engaged in the extension of our spiritual fellowship. If we value our fellowship we should seek to extend it. The spirit which shelters itself behind the phrase "we do not proselytize" is fatal to vigorous church life. "Proselytize" has become an ugly word, but we may surely avoid the offensive proselytism, which glories in mere numerical victories and the wholesale depreciation of other churches, without either flying to the opposite extreme of miserly silence or resting content with indirect methods.

At the Manchester Conference much was said about the relation of Quakerism to the modern world, and there were many who desired that we should forthwith step into the open and give worthy expression to our message. But it has since become abundantly clear that a period of preparation both of heart and mind must precede any great forward movement. The Summer School, so successful in its initiation, may be a powerful agency

in this connection among our older and more established members. But the adequate instruction of our children is of equal importance. Dr. Clifford says: "The future of the Church and of the world hangs upon the wisdom and efficiency, the insight, and the enthusiasm of the Church's ministry to the young." These may seem strong words, but we can hardly prepare more effectually for the future service of our Society than by the provision of Sunday Schools *specially adapted* to our particular needs.

II. *Special character of Sunday Schools.*

It does not meet the case to give scattered or indefinite teaching, or to fall back upon the International Lesson sheets, or the Adult School children's class. We must aim at bringing our children, and those of our attenders who desire it, into living fellowship with us. We must seek in our Sunday Schools to present such a vision of church life and of spiritual service that they may become the nurseries of Quaker prophets.

We would recommend the formation of a representative committee of wise Friends charged with the duty of framing a course of lessons, their aim being to present Bible teaching in the light of Quaker interpretation. We can dispense with the measurements of the tabernacle; no elaborate typology need find a place, nor need the stock stories of Samson and Delilah, or David and

Goliath, occupy a disproportionate share of attention. The Bible should be viewed from the standpoint of Christ. The saints of the Church Universal of all centuries, and our own Quaker prophets and philanthropists of the last two hundred years, might be permitted to stand in the line of their true apostolic succession, carrying down the revelation of the Father's love and the evidence of His presence in the world to our own day. Such a scheme of lessons, graded and selected to suit the ages of the children, might be accompanied by a carefully compiled handbook of suggestions with a list of suitable books for the teacher's use.

There would of course be no compulsion: perfect liberty would still remain to accept or dispense with these lessons, or to develop and expand them; but those teachers who feel the need of help and guidance would no longer be compelled to fall back upon outside assistance.

III. *A substitute for a Catechism.*

A catechism is not acceptable to Friends. The attempt to cast Christian doctrine in a permanent mould tends to arrest the development of truth. A creed once formulated cannot readily be modified, and we may be thankful that we have been spared much of that intellectual dishonesty which is too often the prop of obsolete dogmas. These are conclusive reasons against the adoption of a catechism,

but on the other hand it is not without value. The committal to memory of such concise statements has, in the experience of the Christian church, been widely helpful in promoting definiteness of belief and loyalty to the church fellowship. This is the testimony of men who can in no sense be regarded as mechanical or unspiritual Christians. Is it then possible in some way to preserve what is valuable and, at the same time, altogether to avoid what is harmful and dangerous in the catechism?

We need a more definite conception of our place and purpose in the church of Christ. We incline to think that the difficulty may be met, not by any attempt to formulate a theological statement of belief, but by a concise historical statement of the spiritual development of the Society of Friends, drawn up in such a form that it could readily be committed to memory. The advantages of such a plan are threefold. First :—An historical synopsis would never be obsolete, though it might at times be expanded. Second :—The principles which underlie our fellowship, placed thus in their historical setting, would not have the disadvantage of appearing as final statements, but would stand in the line of adaptation and growth. And finally, the main facts of our Quaker history, learnt at an age when their significance could not be fully understood, would be stored up in the memory to bear fruit in later years.

IV. *Preparation classes for Teachers.*

Throughout the recent literature on Sunday Schools, we have observed as a constant note the demand for the better equipment of the teachers. The fact that so many of the pupils under the care of these 600,000 men and women do not enter the fellowship of any church, cannot be entirely accounted for by the indifference of scholars, though they are often merely perfunctory in their attendance. Professor Adeney's trenchant criticisms, already quoted, gave rise to a considerable correspondence supporting the Professor's cry for reform.

If Friends are to seriously undertake "the religious instruction of the children under their care," they should endeavour to profit by the large experience of other churches, and seek to contribute something towards the solution of the difficulties which are now being felt. We cannot enter upon such work lightly. To us it is perhaps of more importance than to any other church, for our Sunday School must inevitably be associated, not merely with the education of the laity, but with the maintenance of a strong Free Ministry. We would therefore suggest preparation classes held upon a week night, and probably during the winter only, at which Adult School teachers might, perhaps, also attend.

All Sunday School and Adult School teachers in our Society are, of course, voluntary workers, and many have little leisure and small opportunity for study. We would place at their service trained teachers, separated for this particular work, who would stand to these preparative classes just as do the lecturers at our Summer School to the company of Friends who gather there. These trained teachers might also provide the Biblical and Church History teaching at our Boarding Schools, and might indeed be primarily associated with them. By such a method the principle of voluntary service is preserved, but the great advantage of qualified guidance in Biblical study is secured.* This suggestion is in short nothing more than an extension of our educational system.

V. Close Association with the Church.

As a final suggestion we should propose an annual congregational gathering of a social character, at which the report of the Sunday School might be read, and for which the children might be encouraged to prepare essays and to go through some simple examination. It is important that the connection with the fellowship of the church should be close, and that Friends should have their concern for these schools maintained.

We may appear to have travelled far from the original thought of these papers—the Responsibility of a Free

* We propose to treat this suggestion more fully in the next article upon the Bible School.

Ministry—but the religious training of our children is so vital to healthy congregational life that no apology seems needful. The present condition of things is gravely unsatisfactory. There is a gap in the church life. Our young people, especially those who have just completed their education, are left largely to chance influences. We may make allowance for all that is done in various ways to instruct them, but, in view of the smallness of our numbers, the seductions of modern life, and the consequent need for deep conviction, even that “all” is dangerously little.

The Sunday School should be the prelude to active work, and should supply both the Adult School and Mission Field with qualified workers. Already we hear complaints that Adult School teachers are hard to find, and Friends will but exercise common prudence if they so lay out their church work that this source of supply in Christian service is secured.

The wise minute of the Yearly Meeting of 1874 upon the general subject which has occupied us, is singularly appropriate in this connection, and may well close the present discussion :—

“It is greatly to be desired that Friends in their Monthly and other Meetings should fully recognise the responsibility of the Church itself as regards oversight and pastoral care, religious teaching, and the religious instruction of the young, and from time to time consider the state of their respective Congregations in relation to these matters and endeavour under the guidance of their Lord to make appointments and arrangements for these purposes.”

APOSTATE.

O ENGLAND, who hath stol'n the sovereign light
That crowned thy forehead once and made thee
great
By God's decree? Dark-browed and passionate
Thou plungest into the uncertain night;
And sad our love is, bitter the delight
We had in thee, for now unconsecrate,
In angered arrogance, thou affrontest Fate,
Defiant, boasting thine imperial might.
How little reckest thou the shuddering blast
Of the Archangel calling God's Assize!
Amid the tumult of thy victories
Thou heedest not the heavenly judgment passed:
But if thou hast forgotten, yet thou hast
Lovers on whom thy shameless burden lies.

HENRY BRYAN BINNS.

THE WRITINGS OF MAURICE MAETERLINCK.*

MAETERLINCK has been classed with the "Degenerates"; he has been received with incredulity, at times with mockery; he has been laid on the shelf with the mystics.

To fully appreciate his position in the ranks of philosophy, we should be familiar with his friends among the philosophers—with Ruysbrœck and Novalis, with Schopenhauer and Emerson. Let those who can define the limitations of Plato and Plotinus, point also Maeterlinck to his place among the sages.

To be able to estimate the force of his dramatic genius we should have studied the aims and shortcomings of ancient and modern drama; we should know where Æschylus fell short, and where Ibsen administered to the needs of his generation.

Yet to the irresponsible mind, to the untrained ear, there is a pleasure in the exquisite phrases of this gentle writer that compels recognition. Here, at any rate, must we say, is the very flower of literature, let its roots lie in what depths of philosophy they may. But it is more than this. As we are delicately led from thought to thought, there comes back to us echo on echo from some actuality of common life, reconciling us to share his confidence reverently, as one

* In writing the following I wish to disclaim all special knowledge of the subject. This, therefore, is merely an attempt to convey as simply and briefly as possible the impression left on the uncritical mind of a contemporary by M. Maeterlinck's writings. In small space it is impossible to do more than indicate the drift of his thought. Without discussion, without even expressed approval, we can note some of the noble thoughts which "pass across his heart like great white birds."

His published works are: *Le Trésor des Humbles* and *La Sagesse et la Destinée* (translated by A. Sutro). Plays: *La Princesse Maleine*, *L'Intruse et les Aveugles*, *Les Sept Princesses*, *Pelléas et Mélisande*, *Alladine et Palomides*, *Intérieur et la Mort de Tintagiles*, *Aglavaine et Sélysette*. (Some of these have been translated.) Poems: *Serres Chaudes*, *Deux Chansons*. Also introductions to translations from Ruysbrœck and Novalis.

would share the sorrow of a friend. There is an earnestness of purpose in his writing, a care and discrimination in his reasoning which are enhanced by a great beauty of expression. But it is not his style alone that compels us to listen.

Throughout his writings we can trace the natural growth of a larger optimism, all the more impressive because seemingly instinctive and involuntary. "For, than a wilful optimist," as he says himself of Emerson, "there is nothing more disheartening." In his earliest works—poems and plays—thought seems to struggle for bare existence, muffled in symbolism and allegory. In the volume which he has named *The Treasure of the Humble*, for the first time we hear the full note of his philosophy; yet even here his aim is mainly to give expression to ideals; and it is not until later—in *Wisdom and Destiny*—that he has found means of testing them by the light of actual personalities and events.

From the beginning we are struck with the earnestness of his convictions. In *The Treasure of the Humble*, in a series of beautiful chapters, he confides them to us—of the Awakening of the Soul, of the Deeper Life, of the Inner Beauty. It is hard to translate his meaning into other than his own words; it is only by quotation from the writings themselves that one dare attempt to convey their purpose.

. . . . What then is the conviction which forms the main thread about which he has embroidered his message? "I have said," he writes, "that the souls of mankind seemed to be drawing nearer to each other; and even if this be not a statement that can be proved, it is none the less based upon deep-rooted, though obscure, convictions. It is, indeed, difficult to advance facts in support, for facts are nothing but the laggards, the spies and camp-followers of the great forces we cannot see. But, surely, there are moments when we seem to feel, more deeply than did our fathers before us, that we are not in the presence of ourselves alone. Neither those who believe in God, nor those who disbelieve, are found to act in themselves as though they

were sure of being alone." "Men are nearer to themselves, nearer to their brothers: in the look of their eyes, in the love of their hearts, there is deeper earnestness and tenderer fellowship, . . . and signs of a life that we cannot explain are everywhere, vibrating by the side of the life of everyday." "Truly there are centuries in which the soul lies dormant, and slumbers undisturbed. But, to-day, it is clearly making a mighty effort. Its manifestations are everywhere, and they are strangely urgent, pressing, imperious even, as though the order had been given, and no time must be lost." "Though it be, perhaps, from the table-land of speculative thought that this agitation is the most clearly to be noted, yet may there well be signs of it in the most ordinary paths of life, unsuspected of any; for not a flower opens on the hillside but at length it falls into the valley. . . This much, at least, is abundantly proved to us, that in the work-a-day lives of the very humblest of men, spiritual phenomena manifest themselves—mysterious, direct workings, that bring soul nearer to soul." But, as he warns us, we are drawing near to things that are well nigh unspeakable, and such examples as he can give are necessarily ordinary and incomplete. There may be question, for a moment, of a "presentiment, of the strange impression produced by a chance meeting or a look, of a decision that the unknown side of reason had governed, of an intervention, or a force inexplicable and yet understood, of the secret laws of sympathy and antipathy, of elective and instinctive affinities, of the overwhelming influence of the thing that had not been spoken."—"Is it fully borne home to you that if you have, perchance, this morning done anything that shall have brought sadness to a single human being, the peasant, with whom you are about to talk of the rain or the storm, will know of it—his soul will have been warned even before his hand has thrown open the door? Though you assume the face of a saint, a hero or a martyr, the eye of the passing child will not greet you with the same unapproachable smile, if there lurk within you an evil thought, an injustice, or a brother's

tears. A hundred years ago the soul of that child would, perhaps, have passed unheeding by the side of yours."

. . . . It is necessary to realise the strength of this conviction in our sage, as it supplies the keynote to much that he says, whilst leading us through other paths of thought. It affects his attitude towards the past and the future in their relation to daily life, and, above all, it is shown in his theory of the duties of man to man. The human soul, he says, is a plant of matchless unity, whose branches, when the hour is come, all burst into blossom together. "Unaided, the soul can do but little. It is the flower of the multitude." Thus are we governed by the past and by the future; the present is but where they meet. "And, further, we know that the dead do not die. We know now that it is not in our churches that they are to be found, but in the houses, the habits of us all." In our acts our ancestors arise, and the impulses of posterity are formed. "Were the first-born of men to meet the last inhabitant of earth, . . . there would come to them at the same moment, as though one cradle had held them both, comprehension of that which the tongue shall not learn to tell before the world ceases." But two souls, admirable both, and of equal power, may wage pitiless war against each other in the darkness, "whilst it may be that the soul of a convict shall go forth and commune in divine silence with the soul of a virgin." It is in silence that two souls shall meet. "Were I to speak to you at this moment of the gravest things of all—of love, death, or destiny—it is not love, death, or destiny that I should touch." It will be the truth that remained within us unuttered that will have lived for an instant, and by which we shall have been wholly absorbed. "Our myriad intuitions are the veiled queens who steer our course through life, though we have no words in which to speak of them. How strangely do we diminish a thing as soon as we try to express it in words." In silence, then, shall we learn the manifestations of the soul; and, above all, in the silence of misfortune.

. . . . *Sunt lacrimæ rerum.* Our sorrows are the measure of ourselves ; at the last will perhaps be found a sorrow that will wholly purify. But let us not be deceived in this. "There is a tragic element in the life of everyday that is far more penetrating, far more akin to the true self that is in us, than the tragedy that lies in great adventure." Violence is not tragedy. "Does the soul only flower on a night of storm?" There are thousands of laws mightier than those of passion ; it is in the twilight, in the meditation of tranquil moments, that the forces of life will be revealed to us, resistless in their silence. It is this essential tragic element in daily life that will throw light on the existence of the soul. "It is its province to point out to us the uncertain dolorous footsteps of the being, as he approaches, or wanders from his truth, his beauty, or his God. To the silence of sorrow must be added the silence of goodness. Nothing responds so infallibly to the secret cry of goodness than the secret cry of goodness that is near. . . . Therein lies a force that has no name ; a spiritual rivalry that knows no resistance. It is as though this were the actual place where is the sensitive spot of the soul."

. . . . "And the moment has perhaps come when certain new questions should be asked. What would happen, let us say, if our soul were suddenly to take visible shape, and were compelled to advance into the midst of her assembled sisters, stripped of all her veils, but laden with her most secret thoughts, and dragging behind her the most mysterious, inexplicable acts of her life? Of what would she be ashamed? . . . Would she, like a bashful maiden, cloak beneath her long hair the numberless sins of the flesh? She knows not of them, and those sins have never come near her. . . . Are there any sins or crimes of which she could be guilty? Has she betrayed, deceived, or lied? Has she inflicted suffering, or been the cause of tears? Where was she while this man delivered over his brother to the enemy? Perhaps far away from him she was sobbing ; and from that moment she will have become more beautiful and more

profound. She will feel no shame for that which she has not done ; she can remain pure in the midst of terrible murder. Often she will transform into inner radiance all the evil wrought before her. These things are governed by an invisible principle ; and herein, doubtless, has arisen the inexplicable indulgence of the gods.

“And our indulgence, too. Strive as we may, we are bound to pardon ; and when death, “the Great Conciliator,” has passed by, is there one of us who does not fall on his knees and silently, with every token of forgiveness, bend over the departing soul ? When I stand before the rigid body of my bitterest enemy ; when I look upon the pale lips that slandered me, the sightless eyes that so often brought the tears to mine, the cold hands that may have wrought me so much wrong—do you imagine that I can still think of revenge ? Death has come and atoned for all. I have no grievance against the soul of the man before me. Instinctively do I recognise that it soars high above the gravest faults and the cruellest wrongs (and how admirable and full of significance is this instinct !). If there linger still a regret within me, it is not that I am unable to inflict suffering in my turn, but it is, perhaps, that my love was not great enough, and that my forgiveness has come too late.”

. . . . Thus we are led to the two most beautiful essays in this volume—The Deeper Life and The Inner Beauty. Each man has to seek out his own special aptitude for a higher life in the midst of the humble and inevitable realities of daily existence. It is only by communication with the infinite in us that we can attain superiority, and the hero is only distinguished from others by reason of a fuller consciousness of one of these communications. It lies within our power to increase these communications ; and, each time, something is born within us ; each birth brings us nearer to our God. Why must we wait for catastrophe to teach us that there is something grave and earnest in life ? In our “sublime hours,” in our “greater moments of life,” cannot we realise that the faintest cry does not drop into nothingness ? The soul labours in darkness, turning everything that comes to her to beauty,

longing to show to some sister soul the treasure she has prepared. To how many thousands of souls no sister soul ever appears ! Nothing can be lost in the soul ; the pettiest, the unhappiest, have their depths and their moments of splendour. But they have to acquire the habit of dipping into the treasure. Wherefore who can tell, as he bestows a pure word on a passing brother, what unexpected fruit it may hereafter bear ? It is by the strength of some souls that are beautiful that the souls of others are sustained. And it is only by revealing the divine in us that we can discover the divine in others. "One's neighbour, in the truest sense of the term, is that which approaches nearest to God : in other words, all that is best and purest in man." If we truly love our neighbour, then can we, perhaps, perceive truth in happiness as profoundly as some of the heroes perceived it in the radiance of greatest sorrow. "'Even to the very wretchedest of all,' said to me one day the loftiest-minded creature it has ever been my happiness to know, 'even to the very wretchedest of all, I never have the courage to say anything in reply that is ugly or mediocre.' I have for a long time followed that man's life, and have seen the inexplicable power he exercised over the most obscure, the most unapproachable, the blindest, even the most rebellious of souls. For no tongue can tell the power of a soul that strives to live in an atmosphere of beauty, and is actively beautiful in itself."

. And who can tell us of the power that events possess over our lives ? Do we mould the events of our lives, or do they mould us ? Is it to-day or to-morrow that is in the scales ? Or have we not yet done with yesterday ? Do we not often spend our lives in the shadow of something that has not yet come to pass ? "We give the name of destiny to all that limits us." With one, his forethought will avail him nothing, "and the innumerable events that destiny has in store for him will discover him wherever he hide, and will knock one after another at his door." Another will "sally forth day after day in search of adventure, and will return ever empty-handed." What is it that divides us all ? Diverse ways there are by which knowledge of our fellows may come to

us. "Side by side with the necessary dialogue will you almost always find another dialogue that seems superfluous ; but examine it carefully, and it will be borne home to you that this is the only one that the soul can listen to profoundly, for here alone is it the soul that is being addressed." It is in these silent dialogues that the attitude of destiny to each one of us is uncovered.

+ +

These also are the questions repeated in the Plays. In his earliest plays—in *La Princesse Maleine*, especially—he seems hardly to have yet defined to himself the ideal nature of the problem. In the midst of physical violence and catastrophe the characters stagger along the blind pathway of suspense. As with their great prototype Hamlet, all are blind, led by those who will not see. They are secure perhaps in the calm that precludes the storm, or they are clamouring for light, when they should listen for the silences of the tempest. Love, Death and Destiny are ever his theme ; but the treatment undergoes a gradual change. The surroundings have less and less barbarous and extravagant features ; the scenes have a closer relation to everyday life. Let us look for a moment at some of the most spiritual of his plays—the most spiritual because also the most natural.

In *Intérieur*, we are led some evening to a window, and, looking in through its lit panes, we are shown a family in the reposeful occupations or meditations of the home fireside. The door is shut. All is well with the house. But when, he asks, shall we understand that the world does not end with the doors of our houses ? Outside on the terrace the whole simple story is disclosed bit by bit in broken conversation between an old friend of the family and a stranger, who chance to know already of the blow this night has in store for those within. And all the time, the relentless form of Destiny looms closer through the dark, as the villagers slowly bring up along the valley the drowned body of one of the daughters of the house. How can those within be warned ? They come

to the window, and they look out into the darkness ; and they see nothing. This poor child ! Did she throw herself into the water ? Was her little soul craving for a sympathy she could not find ? If her greeting—her farewell !—that morning had been returned somehow differently, would she not have seen that other souls were ready to help ? But we replied without thinking. Alas, not an angel even would see what there was to be seen, and man is only wise after the event. And now it is a crushing blow that we have let her prepare for her friends. What untold difficulty there is in meeting our friends in their sorrows ; and it is not until the foot of Destiny is already planted on the threshold, that we dare break into their peaceful twilight and let in the all-illuminating light of Death.

Death is to us always the intruder. In another play—*l'Intruse*—we sit outside the chamber of mortal sickness, waiting for one that should come. The rustle of the wings of Death are in the wind ; the sound of his scythe is in the grass ; but the intuitions of those who would see, and the warnings of the blind who feel, are alike unheeded. It is not until the stroke falls with always the same crushing sense of disaster, that we wake to see that it is Death whose presence has been with us.

We are like children in our terrible helplessness, however brave a resistance we would make. Like little Ygraine, in *La Mort de Tintagiles*, we know not whether to flatter or curse or pray. We may stand at the door with the prince, in *Les Sept Princesses*, thinking to enter. We have been long expected ; we should knock at once. But the doubts of the bystanders, the advice of a physician, are enough to delay us ; until, with rude hand, Destiny thrusts us through the barrier, only to find that it was Death, at his silent work, that we could not face.

In all these plays the blindness of the characters is one with the blindness of Hamlet. Around Hamlet there is no one but refuses to see. One by one they fail him, when it needed but a spark to kindle light enough to prevent the final disaster. In *Aglavaine et Sélysette* too—

Maeterlinck's latest play—there is the same craving for a power that is never born, a Wisdom that shall mould Destiny. It is a brave struggle for truth and a marvellous growth of beauty ; but the result is sacrifice and unending grief. "The happiness that injures others will not long wear the semblance of happiness in the eyes of the sage."

So by some outwardly simple representation—freed from the obscuring emotions born of violent dramatic action—he would lead us to a deeper consciousness of life. The great forces of life are Love, Death and Destiny, and it is in moments when she goes forth alone to meet these that the soul is made manifest. Much is added to the delicacy of the thought by the subtle simplicity of the language. A word or a whole sentence, re-echoing later in the play, emphasises with startling effect the development that has taken place. Often the characters are so impersonal that not a single one in the play—as in *Les Aveugles*—has a name. Those who have seen *Pelléas et Mélisande* on the stage must be fully conscious of the influence of the "real silences" underlying the dialogue, or intervening between the "little timid words that strangers speak when they meet."

"Some there are that have no silence, and that kill the silence
"around them, and these are the only creatures that pass through life
"unperceived."

+ +

There are signs, we have said, of the growth of a larger optimism in our sage. Having brought us through the twilight of sorrow that we might learn to know our own souls, he would now have us see that it is wrong to think of Destiny in conjunction only with death and disaster. It is true, sorrow has such hold upon us that were a man to live a brilliantly happy life, and yet at the last find an end in crushing disaster, the gloom of the ending would overshadow our whole conception of that life.

All correspondence relative to the contents of the *Present Day Papers* should be addressed to the Editor, J. WILHELM ROWNTREE, "Silverdale," Scalby, R.S.O., Yorkshire.

All subscriptions, and other correspondence, should be sent to HENRY B. BINNS, Acomb, near York.

[ALL RIGHTS OF REPRODUCTION RESERVED.]

A PLEA FOR A QUAKER SETTLEMENT.

“The chances of exceptional genius, moral or intellectual, in the gifted few, are highest in a society where the *average* interest, curiosity, capacity are highest.”—*John Morley*.

IN the previous papers of this series we have attempted to suggest the pressing need for evangelical effort in a world where Christian ideals have taken but partial root. The special capacities for immediate service which lie latent in the Society of Friends have seemed to us to call for development. Our endeavour in this concluding essay will be to point out one more method by which we may fortify ourselves for the work.

As we have said before, we stand to-day in the midst of a widespread materialism,—a little handful of men and women called to be heralds of the “peaceable Gospel.” Around us even the churches seem to share in the false imperialism of the age. Is not the reproach of their silence laid upon us, that we, in their default,

may once again bear practical testimony to the spiritual simplicity of the Kingdom of God, and the higher possibilities of human life?

If we have inherited in a special degree those Christian conceptions of stewardship and of ministry which alone can save the nations of the earth amid the temptations of material development, we are yet but a feeble folk for so heavy a burden. How may we sufficiently brace ourselves to bear it?

We cannot attempt a complete answer, as we are dealing primarily with the free ministry. Nevertheless, the question of our ministry vitally affects the whole service which our Church may render. There is a call for the searching testimony and the stern rebuke of the messenger of God. We need men and women whose lips are touched by the fire of the Holy Ghost, to point our people to the better way. No scheme of education, no Bible School, can create, or alone prepare, these prophets. Is there then no place for a practical consideration of the ways and means by which the religious life of our Society may be fostered? Are we at all answering the questions we have put to ourselves in discussing Quaker education, Sunday and Bible Schools?

Many who feel deeply the needs of our time, and who desire above all else the baptism of spiritual power, listen with indifference, if not with suspicion, to the

advocacy of what are called "practical measures." It is not system, machinery, or organisation, but spiritual power that they seek. Why fit up elaborate pumps to suck water from a well which is already dry? Rather let us repair to the banks of the running stream that flows from the Fountain of Life.

We clearly recognise the limit that must be set to system, organisation, and even religious education, but may we suggest another allegory? Though the phrase is understood, no gardener really *grows* his plants. The secret springs of life that move the sap are altogether beyond his art. He can only obey the laws which enable him to make a tangled waste of weeds blossom in ordered beauty.

The problem before us is not to manufacture ministers or prophets—that is clearly impossible—it is rather to seek those conditions which foster healthy spiritual growth. We cannot create, but if we husband the life we have, the Lord of Life will grant us a richer growth. He does not yield the fruit to the spiritually indolent. The garden of the church must be well tilled, or weeds will choke the soil.

To this extent we believe that what is variously described as "system," "organisation," and "preparation," is not merely desirable, but vital to the continued spiritual health of our Society. We can never lay too

great a stress upon the life of God in the "central depth" of the soul as the true source of power and the foundation of church fellowship, but that is no reason why we should minimise the place of the husbandman in the Church.

We are much concerned lest, in the recoil from a too exclusive dependence on organisation and machinery, a tendency to neglect the essential laws of life should again be developed. Much of our weakness may be traced to such a neglect in the past. Doubtless the primary cause of any shortcoming must be the want of spiritual power, but under what conditions has that spiritual power been lost? Even spiritual power may be dissipated, and it is a grievous fallacy to imagine that a church can continue to flourish independent of certain human conditions. It is unpractical and unwise to disregard the close re-action of life and environment. Is it not obvious that a society, constantly renewed by birth, and more largely by admission, requires the proper application of those influences which make for the continuance of spiritual life? We should never regard want of system as the hall mark of spiritual religion.

It is because spiritual experience is a thing so intangible and of so delicate an aroma that many decry an approach to ordered arrangement. And the objection holds where artificial restriction or mere mechanism are

in question. It is one thing to advocate restriction, it is quite another to advocate the highest possible standard of religious knowledge throughout a society in which a free ministry is maintained.

As we were forcibly reminded at the last Summer School, restriction of the vocal ministry in the early Church led to disastrous consequences. That restriction Rendel Harris has admirably described as "the old Catholic error . . . it was at once the triumph of the Church and its spiritual ruin. It made the bishop, and it slew the prophet." But this restriction was not unconnected with disorders which turned liberty into license. The lesson taught by the history of the early Church has two aspects,—it may serve as a warning against any attempt at restriction which Friends both here and in America may well ponder, but it also teaches us that, even in such a time of spiritual awakening as that which witnessed the dawn of the Christian era, it is dangerous to rely upon untutored freedom. If liberty is to be with power, it must be cherished by those who know the discipline of mental and spiritual training. Fervent zeal must be tempered by knowledge, and warmth of heart must be supplemented by intellect that is under the dominance of truth.

To promote an intelligent knowledge of the Bible, to encourage a large acquaintance with the lessons of

church history and of Christian experience, to indicate for our own generation the lines of service which these suggest, is not to hinder, but rather to favour the unfolding of the spiritual blossom in the heart.

No attempt is now made to take note of all the strong and subtle influences which are brought to bear in the contact of soul with soul. Nor is it pretended that the means suggested are adequate to cover the whole ground. While indispensable, they must remain subordinate, and it is only their neglect which compels us to lay what seems undue emphasis upon them.

Assuming that the question of "preparation" is no longer a difficulty, it is needful, in discussing the problem of a free ministry, to be on the alert against the dangers that attend every reform. If by restriction the early Church slew the prophet and made the bishop, we must be careful that we do not by Learning slay the prophet and make the Rabbi. We feel great unity with the late Professor Bruce when he tells us* that "the bane to be dreaded by churches not sacramentarian in tendency is a *rabbimized pulpit*, offering the people scholastic dogmas or philosophic ideas in place of the gospel."

* In *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*.

“Religious teachers,” he says, “ought to know theology and to be deep, earnest thinkers, but in the *concio ad populum* the prophet should be more prominent than the theologian, and the poet than the philosopher. . . Learning may kill enthusiasm and transform the prophet into a Rabbi. That will mean the decay of the evangelic spirit and a lapse into legalism.”

These are wise words, and they come with more weight from one who maintained that it was “*a question of grave concern*” for all churches, whether “a systematically trained class of professional preachers” could be a legitimate development out of the evangelism of the early Church.

Having boldly stated this doubt, so suggestive to a Friend, and having faced the real danger of Learning, the Professor, speaking of a “learned ministry,” nevertheless says, “My sympathies are very strongly with the advocates of a learned ministry. In my view what we have to complain of is not that the churches have adopted this as their ideal, but that the ministry turned out of their theological seminaries can only by courtesy be described as learned. What we need is not less learning, but a great deal more, and of the right sort.”

Are not Friends, with their spiritual conception of worship and their practical recognition of the common

priesthood of all believers, naturally marked out to provide that "learning of the right sort," which shall not foster Rabbinism, but nurture the prophets? The phrase "a learned ministry" is unsatisfactory, for it suggests the Rabbinism against which Dr. Bruce inveighs; but we sorely need that kind of learning which he supports, a learning which does not concern itself with mint, anise and cummin, but with the weightier matters of the law,—which implies a knowledge of the conditions of progress, and a strong spiritual and intellectual grasp upon the fundamental principles of the higher life.

But the need is for our Society as a whole. We cannot portion off a favoured group, and say that these shall have an equipment specially designed for the ministry in which they are to serve; we must make the basis of our education as wide as the Church. That education may well be adapted to provide a needed equipment in the service of the vocal ministry, but this cannot and must not be its sole aim. Its aim must be nothing less than that of raising the whole standard of efficiency throughout the Church. In practice, those who feel a call to the service of our meetings for worship will perhaps be more ready to take advantage of any privileges which the Church has to offer, but we must not make this our particular concern.

It is easy to see that while we must guard against the danger of Rabbinism, the conditions of our church life protect us so long as we remain faithful to our principle of absolute freedom in the ministry. The establishment of Quaker Sunday Schools, of preparation classes for teachers, of permanent Bible Schools, or of occasional Summer Schools, and the provision of special teaching in our Boarding Schools, and of teachers properly equipped for the purpose, do not necessarily endanger this essential freedom. The very breadth of their scope is their safeguard. Moreover, however much we may avail ourselves of the service of qualified teachers and lecturers (as we have already done to advantage in our Summer Schools), the constitution of our Society makes it necessary that the work of the Church shall be carried on by the voluntary service of men and women who are more or less dependent for their livelihood upon some profession or business. This close touch with the everyday affairs of life in itself provides us with a notable and effective antidote to Rabbinism.

But there is a danger, more serious because less obvious. It is the danger that fear may induce us to do nothing at all. The striking development of the Pastoral System among American Friends is no doubt responsible for much of the widespread fear and caution which exists in our Yearly Meeting. The present writer has enjoyed exceptional opportunities for studying

the Pastoral System, and that study has made a deep impression upon him. It became abundantly clear, in the course of a careful enquiry, that the root cause of this new development was the failure of the ministry under the old order. It is merely begging the question to assert that this failure was in its turn due to the decline of spiritual power. That is of course true, but it is also true that spiritual life languishes where it is not properly cherished. Scarcely any direct means, and often no means whatever, were taken to secure proper qualification and equipment for the ministry. The divine gift was regarded as being independent of human conditions, and the Church suffered the inevitable nemesis of decay. Few Friends realise how complete that nemesis has been. The system, which may now be studied in all the stages of its development, has overrun the Western Yearly Meetings and has made large inroads into the conservative Quakerism of the East. This is not the place for criticism; indeed, we have no sympathy with that policy of criticism which English Friends have sometimes unhappily pursued. But we feel bound to state clearly that this development is to us a matter of the gravest concern, and that after the most careful investigation we believe it involves the increasing departure, more or less conscious, from our fundamental conception of worship. The point of importance for us is this: the Pastoral System,

whether we approve it or no, was established as a consequence of previous failure. Our surest defence against invasion by any such system is to maintain our ideal of fellowship and worship, not as a mere tradition, but with life and power.

The great interest aroused in the Yearly Meeting of 1899 by the minutes of two Quarterly Meetings, and expressed in the weighty letter of advice upon worship and ministry, must not be allowed to die out before some practical measures have been taken. We have on the one hand the call from without to meet the needs of an unspiritual age and to combat the insidious evil which masquerades as "Imperialism," and upon the other the call from within so to establish our Church upon the rock of our ideal that service may be without fear.

If we have now cleared the ground for the consideration of our proposals, let us again emphasise the thought that a free ministry cannot be considered apart from the life of the fellowship. The suggestion of a Bible School does not relate to the vocal ministry as an entity by itself, but relates to it only as part of the whole ministry of the Church. It may, indeed, assist us to understand the place the school is intended to fill if we put the thought of the vocal ministry out of our minds altogether, and consider the "school" in relation to the larger problem.

The modern Paganism, which not only cries in our streets, but utters its voice in our pulpits; which is not only indigenous in the clubs of Pall Mall, but bares its head in a Quaker meeting; suggests something of the terrible misconception which now, as in the time of Christ, surrounds the teaching of the Kingdom. We have but to enquire among our own people to discover the looseness of thought and the dimness of vision which in every church is sapping the vitality of ancient testimonies and destroying the community of service. If the glory of citizenship is to be preserved our people must be nurtured in quietness and in the things of God.

We have in previous essays discussed the needs of our young people, it remains for us to consider the means of equipment which should be made available for those of maturer age.

What is suggested is, in effect, a Way-side Inn, a place where the dusty traveller, stepping aside for a moment from the thronged highway, shall find refreshment and repose. Its outlines have already been sketched in the first essay of this group,* but they may be briefly recapitulated.

It is proposed that a permanent Bible School—not a Theological College—be established, open to any person

* *Present Day Papers*, Sept. "The Problem of a Free Ministry."

of either sex above, say, eighteen years of age. While the curriculum would probably be of special value to those who feel called to serve as teachers or as ministers of the gospel, it would only be so because it aimed at placing pointedly before Friends "the practical, spiritual and non-sacerdotal aspects of divine truth, in relation to individual and national life."

Three main divisions of study suggest themselves *inter alia* :—

Biblical Study.

General Church History.

Quaker Church History.*

To quote from a previous essay:† "These subjects would be handled with the definite intention of giving clearness and force to our spiritual message. The mistake of most theological teaching lies in the fact that truth is conceived as a crystal and not as a seed. To teach general Church History (which, of course, includes the history of our Society) side by side with its spiritual meaning is to avoid this error."

Facilities would be afforded to those whose means and leisure are limited. No fixed term of study would be insisted upon; Friends would be encouraged to make

* Courses of Lectures might with advantage be added upon the Mystics, and upon the economic aspects of the stewardship of wealth.

† September, pp. 30-31.

use of the School whenever opportunity offered, whether for a period of weeks or months. Some would only attend to receive advice which would start them along lines of fruitful study at home. Much assistance could probably be given by means of correspondence classes.

Such is a bald statement of an idea that is capable of considerable expansion and enrichment in detail. At present such a settlement would be most likely to prosper at some favoured resort, which those in search of health and rest might find it easy to visit. The beginning would be on a small scale—a dwelling-house fitted up with a library would probably satisfy the modest wants of our Way-side Inn. Two or three “well-concerned” and qualified Friends would be appointed as teachers and guides, and we are not without scholars of the true spirit for our purpose.

It is important that such a place should not be regarded as merely another privilege of the rich. Local funds in the different Quarterly Meetings could, without objection, be raised to enable any Friend of limited means to avail himself of this opportunity for study; such assistance ceasing, of course, when the Friend returned to his ordinary occupation. Thus the school might offer a partial solution to the difficulties encountered by the “convinced Friend” who feels himself but imperfectly acquainted with the historical traditions of our Society.

Advantage would be undoubtedly derived from attaching a "social wing" to this settlement, an outlet for practical Christianity. There could be no better check than this upon the would-be Rabbi.

The numbers in attendance might not at first be large, and in any case it would probably be desirable only to remain in session for a portion of the year. The teachers, after needful rest, would be profitably employed in study, or in lecturing in the meetings and schools of the Society. The settlement would serve as a permanent centre for the Summer School movement, and it would be comparatively easy to organise holiday camps and reading circles in different parts of the country. Indeed, a temporary school, less costly and elaborate than our two Summer Schools, say of Quarterly Meeting dimensions only, could from time to time be arranged, thus giving the work of the settlement a root in many localities.

Probably those to whom such a settlement would most appeal are young people just beginning life, who have not yet committed themselves deeply in affairs; artisans, assisted to the advantages of study, hitherto denied them; and older Friends, workers in every field, who, having "given out" their message, feel that they stand in need of mental and spiritual recuperation.

school, will be formed within the Society. We believe that upon examination this fear will be seen to be groundless. That some Friends will receive advantages denied to others by the circumstances of life, is inevitable; but it is no new thing. Friends who have received inspiration and help from the quiet study and the spiritual fellowship enjoyed in the settlement will undoubtedly be distributed throughout the country, but if this be to "create a separate class" we may set our fears at rest.

Again, it is urged that the founders of the school may have excellent motives, but that these may be disregarded by a subsequent generation, which will change the open settlement into a college of pastors. We believe this fear to be equally groundless. The idea of a free Quaker settlement does not even hint at restriction in the ministry. Nothing could bring about such a change as is suggested save a widespread dissatisfaction with existing conditions, such as that which prepared the way for the Pastoral System in America. But one of the special provinces of the school will be to bring out into clear relief the lessons of our spiritual experience as a church, and it is difficult to see how a closer acquaintance with the past should involve us in a revolution so alien to its clearest teaching. Indeed, the settlement will be founded to meet the very shortcomings which may otherwise lead us in despair to adopt methods

fatal to spiritual freedom. There is far more danger in the present situation, and in the policy of the *status quo*, than can by the most lively imagination be attributed to such a Friends' Bible School as we have suggested.

In the noisy rush of modern life we need periods of quiet when the soul may feed in peace on that which shall nourish it for action. We need that type of character which in earlier days, by its calm strength, its transparent truthfulness, and its spiritual depth, worked as a leaven of righteousness in the land. Neither a sound education, nor Quaker Sunday Schools, nor a settlement for Bible study can give us all this, but they will contribute to "an intelligent grasp of Christian truth, and the large shaping of Christian character in the mould of a strong manhood and womanhood."

overwhelming against any such supposition. To suppose that during countless ages, from the seaweed up to man, the progress of life was achieved through adjustments to eternal realities, but that then the method was all at once changed, and throughout a vast province of evolution the end was secured through adjustments to external non-realities, is to do sheer violence to logic and to common sense."

That is the thesis, and the more one's thoughts are in harmony with the evolutionary method, the stronger does the argument appear. Such an argument does not ultimately rest only on our belief that there cannot be a permanently beneficial falsehood, but even more on the knowledge of how large a share "use and disuse of parts" have had in modifying species. The inward religious consciousness would have died out had it not constantly had grasp of God, as the musical faculty would have faded if there had been no music, and love if there had been nobody to love.

Of these books we may briefly say that now, at a time when one part of the organized Church is tracking back to sacramental idolatry, and falling into the power of a priesthood akin to heathenism, and alien to the whole mind of Jesus,—the everlasting spirit of pure religion is, in books like these, gripping with sure roots the rock of science, and turning to cling with loving tendrils round the trunk of the tree of world-knowledge.

As the century dawned Wordsworth could say, and his age could echo :—

"To the solid ground of Nature
Trusts the mind that builds for aye."

But in mid-century Nature's face looked cruel, and our faith was dimmed. Now, again, at the close of the eighteen hundreds, the philosophic seer comes from his laboratory, and, responding to the philosophic poet by his lake-side, repeats :—

"To the solid ground of Nature
Trusts the mind that builds for aye."

JOHN W. GRAHAM.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. PREFACE.

II. THE OUTLOOK :

AN EDITORIAL.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Jan., 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. WORSHIP.

II. REVIEWS:

I. BEYSCHLAG'S NEW TESTAMENT
THEOLOGY.—M. A. WALLIS.

II. PRINCIPAL FAIRBAIRN'S CATHOLICISM.
—THE EDITORS.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Feb., 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. THE FACT OF SIN.

II. REVIEW :

WENDT'S TEACHING OF JESUS.—

F. A. RUSSELL.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Mar., 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. THE STEWARDSHIP OF
WEALTH.

II. REVIEW :

THE TEMPERANCE PROBLEM.—

R. SPENCE WATSON.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, April, 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. THE UNLAWFULNESS OF
WAR.

II. REVIEW :

McGiffert's APOSTOLIC AGE.—

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, May, 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. WORK FOR PEACE.

II. REVIEW :

ILLINGWORTH'S PERSONALITY.—

JOAN M. FRY.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, June, 1899. Price 4d.



PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. THE SUMMER SCHOOL.

II. REVIEW :

THE YEARLY MEETING'S LETTER ON
WORSHIP AND MINISTRY.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, July, 1899. Price 4d.



"And all the windows of my heart I open to the day."—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

A MONTHLY SERIES OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS
Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B.
BINNS, and primarily appealing to the Society of Friends.

January	-	THE OUTLOOK.
February	-	WORSHIP.
March	-	THE FACT OF SIN.
April	- -	THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH
May	- -	THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
June	- -	WORK FOR PEACE.

Price **4d.** each net, or **5d.** post free,

from the Publisher, to whom Annual Subscriptions should be sent.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. ROBERT BARCLAY OF URY.

—F. A. RUSSELL.

II. REVIEW :

CHEYNE'S JEWISH RELIGIOUS LIFE.

—G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Aug., 1899. Price 4d.



"And all the windows of my heart I open to the day."—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

A MONTHLY SERIES OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS
Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE, and HENRY B.
BINNS, and primarily appealing to the Society of Friends.

- January - THE OUTLOOK.
February - WORSHIP.
March - THE FACT OF SIN.
April - - THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH
May - - THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
June - - WORK FOR PEACE.
July - - THE SUMMER SCHOOL.
-

Price 4d. each net, or 5d. post free,

from the Publisher, to whom Annual Subscriptions (4/-) should
be sent.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. THE PROBLEM OF A FREE
MINISTRY.

II. REVIEW :

GRUBB'S SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE
QUAKER FAITH.

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Sept., 1899. Price 4d.



"And all the windows of my heart I open to the day."—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

A MONTHLY SERIES OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS
Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B.
BINNS, and primarily appealing to the Society of Friends.

- January - THE OUTLOOK.
February - WORSHIP.
March - THE FACT OF SIN.
April - - THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH
May - - THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
June - - WORK FOR PEACE.
July - - THE SUMMER SCHOOL.
August - - ROBERT BARCLAY OF URY.
-

Price 4d. each net, or 5d. post free,

from the Publisher, to whom Annual Subscriptions (4/-) should
be sent.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

- I. QUAKER EDUCATION.
II. PRIESTLINESS: THOMAS HODGKIN.
III. WHEN THERE IS NO PEACE.
IV. REVIEW: ROBERTSON'S CHRISTIAN
MINISTER.—C. M. ALBRIGHT.
-

J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B. BINNS.

YORK, Oct., 1899. Price 4d.



"And all the windows of my heart I open to the day."—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

A MONTHLY SERIES OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS
Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE and HENRY B.
BINNS, and primarily appealing to the Society of Friends.

- January - THE OUTLOOK.
February - WORSHIP.
March - THE FACT OF SIN.
April - - THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.
May - - THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
June - - WORK FOR PEACE.
July - - THE SUMMER SCHOOL.
August - - ROBERT BARCLAY OF URY.
September - THE PROBLEM OF A FREE
MINISTRY.
-

Price 4d. each net, or 5d. post free,

from the Publisher, to whom Annual Subscriptions (4/-) should
be sent.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

- I. THE PROPHETS' NURSERY.
II. "APOSTATE."
III. REVIEW: WRITINGS OF MAURICE
MAETERLINCK.—HUGH E. SEEBOHM.
-

YORK, Nov., 1899. Price 4d.



"And all the windows of my heart, I open to the day."—

WHITTIER.

PRESENT DAY PAPERS. VOL. II.

A MONTHLY SERIES OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS
Edited by J. WILHELM ROWNTREE, and primarily
appealing to the Society of Friends.

- January - THE OUTLOOK.
 - February - WORSHIP.
 - March - THE FACT OF SIN.
 - April - - THE STEWARDSHIP OF WEALTH.
 - May - - THE UNLAWFULNESS OF WAR.
 - June - - WORK FOR PEACE.
 - July - - THE SUMMER SCHOOL.
 - August - - ROBERT BARCLAY OF URY.
 - September - THE PROBLEM OF A FREE
MINISTRY.
 - October - - QUAKER EDUCATION.
-

Annual Subscriptions, 5/- post free.

Published at ACOMB, York, by HENRY B. BINNS.

PRESENT DAY
PAPERS. VOL. II.

I. A PLEA FOR A QUAKER
SETTLEMENT.

II. REVIEW: FISKE'S LITTLE BOOKS.—

J. W. GRAHAM.

YORK, Dec., 1899. Price 4d.



**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW**

**RENEWED BOOKS ARE SUBJECT TO IMMEDIATE
RECALL**

LIBRARY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Book Slip-50m-12,'64(F772s4)458

351411

Present day papers.

BX7601

P7

v.2

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

